OXFORD PAMPHLETS ON WORLD AFFAIRS
No. 66

THE UPHILL WAR

Sept. 1939—Nov. 1942

By
R. C. K. ENSOR

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
1944

a war decided by mechanisms. Some of them—notably tanks and aircraft—are exceedingly complicated structures, each comprising many thousands of minutely measured and fitted parts. A modern tank has nearly 7,000 parts, composed of about 40,000 separate pieces of material. To build a model in such cases necessitates the employment of highly-skilled workmen for perhaps a year, perhaps two years; and replicas similarly made will take nearly as long. But for war purposes a few machines would be useless; nothing less than an output of hundreds per month and thousands per year will avail. How is it attained? By the twentieth-century manufacturing method known (in the broadest sense of the phrase) as Mass Production.

Mass production has had so much to do alike with the origin of this war and with its course, that it is indispensable at the outset to define what it is. It involves replacing the hand-and-brain work of the manual engineer by the automatic work of what are known as machine-tools and jigs.[1] To make the tools and jigs required for mass-producing any large and complicated piece of war-equipment may consume a year or eighteen months or two years according to the complexity of the task. During all that time there is no output, save perhaps a trickle of copies produced much as the model was. But as soon as the mass-production plant is completed and set going, the products pour forth in a flood. Output figures leap up from, say, five a month to, say, five hundred or a thousand or several thousand a month, as the case may be. Note, however, that the form of the mass-

[1] The term 'machine-tool' explains itself; for 'jig' it is perhaps worth quoting the definition from *Lockwood's Dictionary of Mechanical Engineering* (1913), which is the earliest citation in the Oxford English Dictionary: 'Jig, an appliance which locates and holds a piece of work and guides the tools which operate upon it'. A 'master-jig' is often itself a construction of great size and complexity.

product cannot be varied in its main features; and even such minor improvements as it is practicable to introduce will entail delays and loss of output.

Now quantity, while essential in the case of war mechanisms, is not the only essential. Design, also, is fiercely competitive. New types of aircraft, tanks, guns, etc., are constantly being evolved; and the improvement is often such as definitely to outclass what went before. But it cannot exert its effect in war until it is mass-produced; and that, as has just been shown, involves (1) a period of waiting, up to two years and even more, before supplies begin; (2) the stereotyping of the model from the moment that its mass production is undertaken. It follows that war-preparedness becomes a matter of timing. The authority responsible for arming a given nation or service is always on the horns of a dilemma. If it mass-produces too late, war may catch it unarmed. If on the other hand it mass-produces too early, it may find, when war comes, that its equipment, though plentiful, cannot stand up to the enemy's.

This dilemma gives a new and overwhelming advantage to an aggressor nation. For its government is alone in knowing beforehand the date at which war will be launched. Blameless peace-loving governments, which will not fight unless they are attacked, let their periods of advantage pass unexploited. But an aggressor government can silently fix the date of its aggression years ahead, and so utilize those years that, when the war comes, it will be found, as if by some curious coincidence, to be at the most advantageous point of mass production in regard to every main requisite of war. Its up-to-date aircraft, tanks, anti-aircraft guns, anti-tank guns, shells, bombs, mines, transport, and equipment of all kinds will then so vastly outnumber everyone else's, that resistance is snowed under.

That is the policy which, from the moment that he entered office in 1933, Adolf Hitler in Germany

pursued. As soon as possible the whole nation was harnessed to the mass production of war material. Under the Treaty of Versailles Germany had undertaken not to have either tanks or fighting aircraft or a conscript army; and thus the Powers whom her rearmament primarily threatened, viz. France and Great Britain, had legal as well as practical grounds for stopping it. They also then had overwhelming force. Yet they did nothing; partly because they had already been so much divided over the disarmament agitation, which German propaganda had cleverly twisted to allow German rearmament on the plea of 'equality'; and partly because the gigantic expenditure on war factories, which did incidentally end Germany's long and painful unemployment crisis, was successfully, if absurdly, represented as having that for its main object. Hitler, of course, was ready to give pacific assurances to anybody at any time.

That his war should yield the fullest return on his mass production, it was necessary that looking ahead he should fix its intended date. This eventually turned out to be August-September 1938, when he confronted a bewildered Europe with a threat of instant battle, only averted by the climb-down of France and Great Britain at Munich. Naturally he did not disclose it in advance, but it could be fixed early. An informal but fairly effective conscription had begun under Papen in 1932, and it would take till 1938 to yield six trained classes—probably the minimum for a war. In 1935 conscription was formalized; and in the autumn of 1936 Hitler called to the colours, not only the class of conscripts due then, but the class due a year later. The only possible motive for this was to provide an extra class of fully-trained soldiers for a war in 1938; and it is surprising that more notice was not taken of it abroad. He completed its effect by calling up the 1938 class in 1937.

Having his date fixed, Hitler refused to be deflected

from it by circumstances. On 18 July 1936 a civil war broke out in Spain between the rival partisans of republican and totalitarian government. The totalitarians had Italian backing; the republicans, Russian. Here was a good 'anti-Comintern' issue for Nazis and Fascists to combine on; an issue, moreover, which would hurt France's strategic sensibilities in regard to Spain, and might lure her into repeating Napoleon III's mistake of 1870 and attacking while ill-prepared a much better-prepared Germany. But Hitler was not mainly concerned to conquer France. He aimed once and for all to conquer Europe. And for that he must wait until his weapons were ready. So he confined himself to sending into Spain a limited number of German aircraft and tanks—too few to commit him beyond withdrawal, but enough to provide his technicians with direct war experience. This proved most valuable in enabling Germany to decide what types to mass-produce, and also to plan out the strategic and tactical use of them. The Spanish war lasted till March 1939, when the totalitarians won.

Two preliminary moves, however, the Fuehrer allowed himself, because he had correctly estimated that they could be brought off without a war. The first of them—in March 1936—was the remilitarization of the Rhineland. This destroyed the chief remaining guarantee of French security under the Versailles and Locarno Treaties. It had a very direct bearing on war production. For such great munitions centres as Cologne, Düsseldorf, and Mannheim–Ludwigshafen were within the area demilitarized by Locarno, and though the Ruhr industries were not, they lay so near as to be barely defensible.

The second move was made in March 1938, exactly two years later. It was the annexation of Austria by Germany. To Hitler, himself an Austrian, this had always seemed the first pre-requisite for German expansion. He attempted it in 1934, when he caused

the Austrian Chancellor, Dollfuss, to be murdered; but Mussolini stopped him by a military gesture. Subsequently Mussolini had been won over; and now without warning columns of armoured and mechanized German troops crossed the frontier at many points. The Austrian army was too weak to resist, and the last Austrian Chancellor, Schuschnigg, was hurried away into captivity. Hitler acquired seven million more German-speaking subjects; and strategically he obtained a projecting salient of land, which could be combined with the parallel German salient of Silesia on the north to hold the Bohemian part of Czechoslovakia as if in a pair of nutcrackers. This part contained Prague, the country's capital, and Pilsen, the seat of its great armament factory, the Skoda Works. Opposite the original German frontier it had what was probably the strongest fortified line in Europe; but opposite Austria it was not so strong.

Hitler's next task was to destroy Czechoslovakia and annex its Bohemian and Moravian areas. But he could not expect to do so without fighting, since both France and Russia were bound by treaty to defend the Czechs. And Great Britain, though not herself bound to the Czechs, would probably sink or swim with France. This, then, was the stage which Hitler timed himself to reach in August–September 1938, the long-planned date when he would be ready for war. As *casus belli*, he stirred up the Sudeten Germans in Bohemia and Moravia to demand incorporation in Germany. Since the territory which they inhabited formed a fringe round the country, including both its natural and its artificial defences, their transfer to Germany would leave Czechoslovakia defenceless.

But when the crisis came, neither Great Britain nor France had enough weapons to fight. They had allowed Germany to mass-produce armaments without either stopping her or sufficiently following suit. Great Britain scarcely began serious preparations for

mass production till 1937. Even then they were half-hearted. No Ministry of Munitions (or Supply) was set up; no proper system of priorities was developed; the task of armament production was left to the Service ministries, whose insufficiency for dealing with it had been abundantly demonstrated in 1914–18. Some of the most urgent needs (e.g. that for heavy anti-aircraft guns) were scarcely tackled at all. France was even worse off. During the years of Hitler's re-armament her attention had been largely drawn away from it by her own acute internal dissensions. The conflict between her revolutionaries and reactionaries bordered on civil war. 'Stay-in' strikes, 'lightning' strikes, and, most disorganizing of all, a 40-hours' week[1] abruptly imposed by law on industries accustomed to 52 or more hours, had brought her factories and engineering plants to a standstill. Strikes involving hundreds of thousands of skilled workers in her armament trades were in full swing till within eight days of the order for mobilization. Throughout 1938 her output of aircraft, tanks, and war vehicles of all kinds had fallen to near zero.

It was in these circumstances that Great Britain and France gave way to Hitler and concluded at Munich on 29 September 1938 one of the great capitulations of history. The Fuehrer had brazenly raised his terms during the negotiations, but the two Powers accepted them all. Czechoslovakia, though she was France's ally, was stripped of her defensive territories and left helpless, with no protection against further seizure save a worthless promise from the signatory Powers. These were Germany, Italy, Great Britain, and France. Russia, though she was France's ally and had joined with her in guaranteeing Czechoslovakia's integrity, was left entirely out of the affair—a course from which she could and did draw her own conclusions. On

[1] In Germany the working week in armament and related industries had been raised to 60 hours.

21 February 1939, a Havas despatch from Moscow announced that she considered herself released from any obligation to France or England.

It is not intended here to discuss the political factors which contributed to this—in particular the policy of so-called 'appeasement', which British and French statesmen had been pursuing towards Hitler, and of which Munich in some of its aspects was the culmination. Militarily the only gain to the Allies was time—eleven months, as it proved in the event—for rearming. Owing to the time-lag involved in mass production, this failed to save France, despite some industrial revival following suspension of the 40-hours' week; and it only saved Britain by the narrowest margin. Had the Battle of Britain come two months earlier, it might well have been lost. On the other hand, the eleven months were temporarily a gain to Hitler, because during them his mass-products were pouring out, while those of the Allies were merely being prepared for; so that his immediate superiority in arms when the war came was greater, not less, than it had been at Munich. In addition he had gained Czechoslovakia. The elaborate fortifications, the scientifically equipped Czech army, the unique arms factories of Pilsen and Brno, and immense new facilities for attacking Poland —all succumbed to him in the sequel without his firing a shot. These were prizes indeed.

Those of them not given under the Munich Agreement were annexed on 15 March 1939. At Munich Hitler had insisted that he wanted nothing more beside the German-speaking areas. Less than six months later he overran the Czech areas also. Britain and France, despite Munich promises, protested but did not resist. But the heads of the British Government saw at last where they stood. Hitler went on to enforce the lesson by wrenching the port and district of Memel from Lithuania (20 March 1939); while Mussolini, now fully displayed as his fellow-aggressor,

annexed by the same methods Albania (7 April 1939). Meanwhile German troops were poured into Slovakia, which had been declared independent but was obviously to be used as a means of outflanking Poland. It was in these circumstances that (24 March 1939) Great Britain gave a unilateral guarantee to Poland, which already was (as Czechoslovakia had been) in alliance with France. The guarantee was made bilateral by a joint Anglo-Polish Declaration (6 April 1939). Hitler meanwhile on 24 March and again on 28 April made demands on Poland for the incorporation of Danzig in Germany, and the concession of a road and rail connection (which should be German territory) across the Polish province of Pomorze. These demands, if granted, would have broken Poland much as the annexation of the Sudetenland broke Czechoslovakia. The Polish Government refused them, but Hitler persisted, and on 28 April annulled the German-Polish Pact of Non-Aggression. In Danzig and in Germany he whipped up an artificial agitation against Poland, just as he had a year earlier against Czechoslovakia, at the same time transporting very large forces into East Prussia by sea. By July they were spilling over into Danzig, in violation of that city's status.

As the danger darkened, the British Government, presided over by Mr. Neville Chamberlain, became more active, both at home and abroad. At home it announced on 20 April the formation of a Ministry of Supply, and a week later it carried in the House of Commons against official Labour and Liberal opposition a resolution in favour of conscription.[1] Abroad it gave unilateral guarantees to Rumania and Greece, and signed a treaty with Turkey, whereby each party undertook to assist the other if attacked by any Power except Russia. But the weak point about this

[1] The Bill implementing this passed its third reading on 18 May, exactly fifteen weeks before Hitler struck.

diplomacy (and especially the guarantee to Poland) was that we did not secure the support of Russia. We sought it; but Stalin deemed it indispensable for his defence to occupy the three small Baltic States (Lithuania, Latvia, and Esthonia), and this we were unwilling to countenance. Russia therefore conducted parallel negotiations with Germany; and on 23 August 1939 the world was electrified by the news of a German–Soviet Pact, under which Russia was to have the three Baltic States, provision being made for the transfer of the German elements in them to Germany. Secret clauses arranged also for a partition of Poland, and for Russia to have a strip of Finland.

All was now clear for Hitler to strike his blow; and after a farce of ultimatums, which Poland was given no chance to answer, the Germans invaded Poland across every accessible frontier before dawn on 1 September 1939. The Second Great War had begun.

2. How Germany Exploited Her Advantage

'Never can there have been or ever be', wrote the British Ambassador to Germany, Sir Nevile Henderson, 'a case of more deliberate and carefully planned aggression'.[1] There was not a single Power in Europe, from whom Germany, if she kept the peace, had to apprehend either present or prospective attack. But she began total mobilization in East Prussia on 15 August and elsewhere on 25 August. The Polish mobilization in reply was not dated till 30 August, and even then at the request of Great Britain and France it was postponed till 31 August. This pacific delay cost the Poles dear; but the fate of their army was sealed in any case by the overwhelming superiority of Germany's mass-produced equipment.

The main campaign only lasted three weeks. The

[1] Cd. 6115 of 1939, p. 21.

Poles fought bravely against impossible odds. The treaty-makers of 1919 had bequeathed to them indefensible frontiers, which the Germans could attack along broad fronts on three sides—north, west, and south. The Poles put into line 22 divisions of infantry and 7 brigades of cavalry; they had no armoured divisions, two tank brigades, and few anti-tank or anti-aircraft guns. The Germans invaded with 54 divisions, of which no fewer than seven were armoured and seven motorized; and they used over 2,000 first-line aircraft. The Poles had about 700 aircraft, but though excellently manned a large proportion of them never took the air; for the very first German blow—struck before any other rupture of peace—was the bombing at dawn of the Polish airfields, and destruction of their machines on the ground. In a short time the Germans obtained complete command of the air; in daylight and from low levels they could bomb at leisure almost any target that they pleased; and at the same time their armoured divisions, aided by fine weather and hard ground went careering through and behind the Polish lines, at speeds per hour and for distances per day never before seen in warfare. Between them they cut telephones and communications everywhere, and in a few days reduced the greater part of a well-organized army into a mob of disconnected units. By mid-September nearly all Western Poland was overrun; the Polish Government had left Warsaw; and what remained of the Polish army was struggling against desperate odds to hold a line of river-fronts just covering the capital. Then a new weight was cast into the scale. Acting under the German-Soviet Treaty, Russian forces invaded Poland in the rear; the Polish President and Government crossed (17 September) into Rumania; and the end soon came. Warsaw held out ten days longer, but it was ruthlessly bombed into surrender, with heavy civiliar casualties, from the air. There followed a partitior

of Poland, in which Germany took 73,000 square miles with 22 millions population, and Russia 77,000 square miles with 13 millions.

The Polish disaster was misunderstood at the time, and the victims blamed undeservedly. It should have taught two things: first, that against tanks and aircraft troops without counter weapons, however brave and numerous, are merely sheep for slaughter; second, that aircraft can heighten overwhelmingly the effect of an opening blow against an unexpecting adversary. Neither lesson being learned, the first was repeated in 1940 on the fields of France, and the second in 1941 at Pearl Harbour.

Meanwhile Poland's Western Allies, Great Britain (with all the Dominions except Eire supporting her) and France, had declared war on 3 September. The French Army duly mobilized, and a British Expeditionary Force under Lord Gort was sent to its aid. Although its transport arrangements were made at high speed and without interference by the enemy, it was not till 3 October that portions of it took over a sector of the French line. This sector ran along part of the Franco–Belgian frontier. The original strength of the B.E.F. was two corps of two divisions each, with corps and army troops; they were increased to three divisions each by mid-winter. There was also an Air Component of the R.A.F.—one Fighter Wing and one Bomber-Reconnaissance Wing; besides an independent Advanced Air Striking Force posted near Rheims.

On either side of the Franco–German frontier were broad zones of defence in depth, known as the Maginot Line and the West Wall respectively. During the Polish campaign French troops nibbled at the West Wall and occupied some of its forward positions. The Germans re-took them when the Polish war was over. Then inactivity descended on the armies for the winter, neither side moving for over five months. Air attacks

at the same time were, as if by tacit agreement, almost confined to naval objectives. In Poland the Germans had used aeroplanes ruthlessly against civilians, but the French, nervous about their own weak air defences, neither retaliated nor wanted the British to retaliate. This period of inactivity the Americans christened 'the phoney war'. Only the German–British naval struggle still seemed alive.

That had been re-started in 1918 shape. The British blockaded Germany with a line drawn across the Straits of Dover and another from Scotland to Norway via Orkney and Shetland. The Germans relied primarily on U-boats, one of which as early as 3 September 1939 sank the liner *Athenia*, without warning, drowning many passengers. On 18 September another sank the aircraft-carrier *Courageous*, and on 14 October yet another penetrated the anchorage of the British Grand Fleet and sank the battleship *Royal Oak* at her moorings. On the whole, however, the British Navy had the measure of the U-boats at this stage; nor did a German attempt to supplement them by using battleships as commerce raiders succeed for long. On 13 December at the battle of the River Plate the German pocket-battleship *Admiral Graf von Spee* was tackled by three British cruisers with gun-power much inferior, and driven into Montevideo so badly damaged that on 17 December she scuttled herself. This victory, due to all-round superior dash and skill on the British side,[1] was the first heartening event for the Allies in the war.

Meanwhile Russia had followed up the partition of Poland by seeking to realize the other gains, to which Germany in the August treaty had consented. Estonia,

[1] The final superiority was in accuracy of gunfire, and there perhaps too little attention has been paid to the fact that the British ships had an aircraft (H.M.S. *Ajax*'s) spotting for them, whereas the *Graf Spee*'s aircraft, like H.M.S. *Exeter*'s, was disabled before it could take the air.

Latvia, and Lithuania submitted, but Finland would not; and on 30th November the Russians launched an invasion. In the ensuing winter campaign the Finns at first had the best of it. Against what was deemed a German-Russian *bloc*, Britain and France were willing to give them direct support, provided that they asked for it and that a virtually solid Scandinavia backed the request. But both conditions were blocked by the attitude of Sweden and Norway. Russian numbers told; and by the Treaty of Moscow (13 March 1940) Finland conceded the Soviet's demands. The Allies who had assembled a small expeditionary force, dispersed it. Disappointment in France caused a change of Government there.

As winter ended, Hitler struck again. The Germans had been using the territorial waters of Denmark and Norway to pierce the British blockade. On 16 February the British destroyer *Cossack* rescued 299 British merchant seamen from the German ship *Altmark*, which was carrying them as prisoners through Norwegian territorial waters, and on 8 April the Allies notified the mining of three areas in those waters. But the very next day Germany launched her next long-prepared aggression. Following her invariable technique of a massive invasion at many points without warning at dawn, she fell simultaneously on Denmark and Norway. Denmark yielded without fighting. The Norwegians resisted, and in Oslo Fiord sank a German battle-cruiser. Yet the Germans occupied Oslo, Bergen, Trondheim, and Narvik all on the first day—every fully equipped port in the country. Almost as quickly they seized all its airfields in the south.

The campaign in Norway was difficult for the Germans since they could not get there by land, but must cross the broad Skagerrak. They won it by air power. On 9 April the British Grand Fleet was steaming off Bergen, when a handful[1] of German bombers attacked. A destroyer was sunk, two cruisers were damaged and

the flagship *Rodney* itself was hit by a bomb which did considerable mischief, though it failed to pierce the deck armour. Thenceforth (with one small exception) no surface naval craft were sent into the Skagerrak, and so the Germans could reinforce in Norway without limit. This fact alone foredoomed the two small Allied forces, which on 16 and 18 April landed on either side of Trondheim, at Namsos and Aandalsnes respectively. But aviation also defeated them directly. As they had no airfield, they could not operate fighter aircraft[2], and suffered the extremity of low-level daylight bombing; nor could they land anti-aircraft guns, since the bombers destroyed the cranes and jetties. Within just over a fortnight both forces had to be re-embarked. Only far north at Narvik, where in two daring actions on 10 and 13 April the Navy had annihilated the local German warships and supply ships, did a force of British, French, Poles, and Norwegians succeed in taking the town. Later, owing to the French disaster, they had to be evacuated.

King Haakon and his ministers left Norway, with powers from their parliament to continue the war.

The shock of Norway caused a change of Government in Great Britain; Mr. Churchill succeeded (10 May 1940) Mr. Chamberlain. He at once set up a Ministry of Aircraft Production, destined to make the aircraft industry the largest in Britain. The new Government was a three-party coalition, and its head on meeting the House of Commons three days later warned the country that he had nothing to offer it but 'blood, toil, tears, and sweat'. Already on that same 10 May (concomitant, but not cause of the change) Hitler had launched his main European offensive. He attacked Holland, Luxembourg, and Belgium. The

[1] It has been truly said that, had there been more of them, the *Prince of Wales* catastrophe might have been anticipated, and had they carried torpedoes, Pearl Harbour. As it was, we purchased our lesson cheaply.

[2] An attempt to do so off a frozen lake ended in the obvious way.

technique was the same as before. He had treaties of friendship with them all, and had only recently reaffirmed his pacific intentions. At dawn without warning he fell on them, both by land and by air.

From the outset things went well for the Germans. Holland and Belgium endeavoured to combine their strategy, and the northern French armies, including the B.E.F., moved forward over the Franco–Belgian frontier to their aid. But the German plans had been well laid, and made skilful use (as in Norway, but on a larger scale) both of parachutists and of treachery within the invaded country. Thus they were able to attack Rotterdam the first day, and captured its aerodrome and much else. Early also, an armoured thrust pierced to the Moerdijk bridges in the centre of Holland, the vital waist connecting the north and the south of the country. Dutch resistance only lasted four and a half days, and on 14 May all Dutch troops save those in Zeeland (who did not hold out for long) laid down their arms. The capitulation was necessitated by the loss of Moerdjik, but it was expedited by the murderous bombing of Rotterdam. Repeating their Warsaw method, the German aircraft flew low over central Rotterdam in daylight and reduced it to rubble, with great loss of civilian lives; and they threatened to do the same elsewhere, failing instant surrender. The Dutch Queen and Government escaped from the country.

Meanwhile the Belgian defence had also gone badly. At the outset there was a failure to demolish important bridges over the Meuse and the Albert Canal, in consequence of which the Belgians lost their forward line. The main line, of which the British and French formed part, ran south from Antwerp through Louvain and Namur. But as early as 16 May the Allies were ordered by the French Generalissimo to abandon it and fall back to the line of the Schelde, which they reached on the 19th. The chief reasons for this

was that already German armoured divisions quickly traversing the Belgian Ardennes had broken through the French Ninth Army and crossed the Meuse between Sedan and Mézières. Here it must be recalled that the Maginot Line covered France's frontier with Germany only; her frontier with Belgium was unfortified, save for the sector held during the winter by the B.E.F. This armoured break-through proved to be the central feature of German strategy. Five divisions conducted it; Amiens was reached on 18 May; Abbeville on the 20th. Thenceforward the B.E.F. and the northern French armies were isolated from the rest and from their own reserves. The German force turned north up the coast towards Boulogne to attempt the biggest encirclement in history.

It would take too long to trace here the kaleidoscope of the following fortnight. The governing factor in it was that the Allies had neither tanks enough nor anti-tank guns to stand up to the units of massed German armour. The gallant French and Belgians fared no better in this than the gallant Poles had done. On 27 May the Belgian army under its King, hard hit and at the end of its munitions, had to capitulate. The other encircled armies then withdrew into a bridgehead round Dunkirk, and from there the men (but not their equipment) were retrieved by the famous effort of British seamanship under the protection of the Navy and the home-based R.A.F. No fewer than 224,584 British and 112,546 allied (mostly French) troops were rescued in this way.

The French campaign was not over, but it had been decided. While Dunkirk occupied the Germans, an attempt was made under General Weygand (who had succeeded General Gamelin as French commander-in-Chief) to reorganize the French armies along the line of the rivers Somme and Aisne. But on 7 June the German armour dashed forward from a Somme bridgehead; on 9 June it reached Rouen; on 10 June

it crossed the Seine between Rouen and Vernon; the same day Italy declared war and attacked France in the south. On the 14th the Germans entered Paris. The French Government had withdrawn—first to Tours, then to Bordeaux; there on the 16th the Reynaud Government made way for a Pétain–Weygand combination, which at once ordered the French army to stop fighting and asked Hitler for peace. This downfall had for accompaniment a complete civil and military collapse, with millions of refugees jostling the soldiers off the roads and the unresisted German aviation bombing both indifferently. On 21 June at Compiegne, in the railway carriage used by Foch for the 1918 armistice, the armistice of 1940 was signed by the French delegates. On 24 June they signed one with Italy.

What would Great Britain do? Outside her people and Empire, few thought she could continue. Friends as well as foes shared Mussolini's conviction that Germany had won the war. But the British never wavered, and their courage was crystallized by its interpreter. Mr. Churchill's broadcast of 17 June and his great speech on the 18th were supreme examples of the creative leadership which moulds history. Many too felt instinctively (and the instinct had much to warrant it) that the loss of a land-front in Europe might really be a gain. They remembered how many British lives it cost in 1914–18 to keep such a front in being.

But for the moment the island was weaponless. Had Hitler after Dunkirk made Britain his first target instead of France, both nations might have fallen. At one stage the equipped troops available for defence numbered but a single division. Even after Bordeaux an immediate heavy night air campaign might have proved irresistible. Spitfires and heavy anti-aircraft guns only began coming in numbers off the lines about midsummer, and priority for the latter had to be given to ships. Luckily the *Luftwaffe*, designed essentially

for army co-operation, had then scarcely any trained night-bombers. Meantime on and after 17 June every effort was made to pull our ships and men out of France (including Allies such as Poles); while the bases of the Home Guard were laid in England, and under General de Gaulle a Free French movement was formed But the Bordeaux Government (soon transferred to Vichy) stuck at little in toadying to the conqueror. Many hundreds of trained German pilots, whom the R.A.F. had brought down, were repatriated against our protest. Most instant was the problem of the French warships, which there was nothing in the armistice terms to keep from German hands save a worthless German undertaking. The British Navy, therefore, took over or immobilized those under its control, and with the same object at Oran and Dakar even fought actions against the French.

The Germans now controlled the coastline of Europe from South France to North Norway. Hitler could use it to attack Great Britain (1) by invasion, (2) by air, (3) by submarine blockade. He prepared all three; but as the first had to wait on the second, it was not actually launched. On 8 August he began the necessary preliminary—a series of daylight air attacks. Though it never passed beyond the air stage, this was a true counterpart to the Battle of France, and was fitly named the Battle of Britain. The issue of the war turned on it; for, had it been lost, Britain must have shared France's fate. It lasted till the end of October; but the R.A.F., though constantly and often greatly outnumbered, had the better of almost every engagement. In the whole period the number of German aircraft certainly brought down in daylight was 2,375, besides a large number of 'probables'. One day, 15 September, witnessed the destruction of 185. The R.A.F. lost in all 375 pilots killed and 358 wounded; but at the end was stronger in fighter machines and pilots than at the beginning.

The high bravery and superior training of the British airmen counted for much in the victory, but essentially it was due to superior types of machine, put later into mass production than the enemy's, and just—though only just—forthcoming in sufficient numbers. The effect was like that of the Marne in 1914; it did not win the war, but it stopped the rot. 'Never', said Mr. Churchill, 'in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few.'

Invasion being baulked, the Germans turned to night-bombing, and for nearly nine months (7 September 1940–16 May 1941) the British people suffered an intensity of air attack then without precedent. It began in London, which was raided in the first instance on 82 out of 85 consecutive nights. A.A. guns were still so scarce there, that warships were actually hazarded up the Thames to supplement them. Later, following (14 November) a sensationally successful raid on Coventry, the attack was switched to the provinces, and Birmingham, Manchester, Sheffield, Liverpool, Hull, Southampton, Bristol, Portsmouth, Plymouth, Tyneside, Clydeside, and Belfast were among the areas most heavily bombed. Whether judged by damage or casualties, London bore the brunt; yet in proportion some of the smaller cities were even harder hit. In London no fewer than 1,150,000 houses were damaged; and twice as many were made uninhabitable as in all the rest of the country. But in Portsmouth out of 70,000 houses only 5,000 escaped damage.

Down to the end of 1941 some 190,000 high explosive bombs were dropped in Great Britain; 43,667 civilians were killed and 50,387 seriously injured. But the onslaught was a failure. The island was not disabled and refused to be terrorized; and its free people showed remarkable powers of organization and endurance in solving problems of passive defence. Two things helped—one, that bombing was not, as on

the continent, the accompaniment of invasion; the other, that the U.S.A. and Canada stood behind, able to go on supplying munitions, even if the British factories were destroyed. But most of them never were; in this and in some other respects the German effort was amateurish.

The development of American supplies drew much stimulus from the air campaign. When the war began, there was a law on the United States' statute-book forbidding any sale of weapons or munitions to a belligerent country. This provision, favourable to the aggressors, was not repealed until 4 November 1939; when war sales were permitted on a defined basis known as 'cash and carry'. The purchaser had to pay in dollars before delivery, and he had to ship the goods himself. On this footing Britain and France placed large contracts, which after the fall of France enured to Britain only. By degrees the United States Government also became active in developing war production. In May 1941 the President told Congress that the country should be 'geared up to the ability to produce at least 50,000 planes a year', and big appropriations were made for armaments. Later, when Britain ran short of dollars for 'cash and carry', the 'Lend Lease' Bill was introduced at the beginning of 1941, and became law on 11 March. It ensured that no monetary difficulty should limit supplies.

On another side, also, America became increasingly lined up behind Britain—that of the sea war. After her defeat in the Battle of Britain, Germany's best hope of crushing the island lay in her submarines. Britain's naval resources were stretched very tight, especially in destroyers. Early in September she concluded an agreement with the United States, whereby she received fifty American destroyers, while the United States was given the right to lease naval and air bases in Newfoundland, British Guiana, and certain of the British West Indies. Britain, again, after the

fall of Denmark and Norway, had occupied the Faeroes and Iceland. In April 1941 the United States supplemented this by occupying Greenland, and later she took over the burden of Iceland also.

3. How the War Became World-wide

Concerned though he must have been at Britain's survival and America's backing, Hitler does not seem to have taken either seriously enough. He had (as no one who has studied his writings and speeches can doubt) an overmastering faith in the superiority of land-power over sea-power. If Germany's army, with that of her Italian Ally, could subdue continental Europe and adjacent Asia—a conquest on which those of Africa and the Middle East must follow—then she would have land-supplies of all necessary raw materials and might snap her fingers at the sea-going Anglo-Saxons, whose 'pluto-democracies' could not long resist her. As a thorn in America's side, she would favour Japan; but her prime need was to crush the Soviet. For the future which the Fuehrer visualized for the German race involved its absorbing and colonizing vast tracts in Poland, the Ukraine, and South Russia.

Signs of this new trend appeared towards the end of 1940. On 27 September, Germany, Italy, and Japan signed a Tripartite Pact of alliance and demarcation, with a clause pointed at the United States. In the winter Washington received reports that Germany intended to attack Russia, and early in 1941 passed them on to Moscow. In March further reports were received to the same effect, and were again passed on. But for the moment the mover was Italy and the theatre the Mediterranean. The collapse of France had placed Britain in a most difficult situation there, both on land and afloat. It was left for her commanders —General Sir Archibald Wavell and Admiral Sir Andrew Cunningham—to work wonders with inferior

forces. The Italian armies in Libya and Abyssinia were much too large to be prevented from invading Egypt and Kenya, and, on 13 September, as soon as the summer heat abated, a great force under Marshal Graziani crossed the Egyptian frontier. Harassed by British patrols, it reached Sidi Barrani, but there stayed inactive for nearly three months. In October Italy launched an unprovoked attack (of the usual pattern) against Greece, using Albania as her advanced base. Surprise procured some initial success ; but the Greeks rallied, and despite inferior equipment pushed the invaders back. Meanwhile on 11 November the great naval victory of Taranto restored supremacy in the Mediterranean to the British fleet. The striking force were naval aircraft flown from H.M.S. *Illustrious* ; they torpedoed at anchor and crippled no fewer than three of the six capital ships composing the Italian battle-fleet. On 11 December it was the British army's turn. General Wavell, who had been reinforced with Indian, Australian, and New Zealand troops, opened an armoured and mechanized offensive which in 62 days drove the Italians not merely out of Egypt but out of Cyrenaica, annihilating the Italian army there, seizing all its strongholds, inflicting heavy casualties, and capturing 133,295 prisoners with 1,300 guns and immense booty. When it is added that his striking force was only about 30,000 strong and inferior to the Italians in equipment, the brilliancy of the exploit can be seen. The army was well served by a superior navy and air force ; but in the main its success was a supreme example of what the new tactics could do.

Defeated by Greeks and British alike, the Italian aggressors were halted, but behind them stood their German partners preparing. During the winter Germany secured the aid of Rumania and Bulgaria, and equipped them with airfields for an offensive. By mid-February the Greek Government realized what this meant, and consulted Great Britain, who decided

to send an expeditionary force. It consisted of an armoured brigade, two infantry divisions, and some corps artillery. This was a serious—indeed in the event disastrous—subtraction from Wavell's African strength, yet really little more than a token force in Greece; and after the German push came on 6 April, it and the Greeks were speedily overwhelmed. Two things increased the defeat; the Yugoslavs, who only at the last moment and by an internal revolution took their stand against the aggressor, were caught unready and crushed unexpectedly soon; and the Allies fought with negligible air strength, while the Germans operated more than 1,000 machines. The transport of the force to Greece was effected without loss, attempted Italian naval interference being quelled by Admiral Cunningham's brilliant night-victory off Cape Matapan (28 March 1941). But it was otherwise with the re-embarkation (24–30 April), when German air attack inflicted considerable losses—both of transports and of destroyers. The troops brought away their rifles, but no artillery and no transport.

Ejected from the mainland, the British retained Crete, one of the most valuable strategical areas in the Mediterranean. But not for long. Though it contained three aerodromes, the attempt was made to hold it without fighter protection, with the same results as in Greece. The Germans stormed it from the air; and only about half the garrison were evacuated, again at serious cost to the British fleet.

The Greek and Cretan defeats illustrated the heavy handicap under which Britain fought in the Eastern Mediterranean. Her mass production of fighter aircraft was now large, and their quality excelled that of the Germans. But whereas the Germans could fly a machine from airfield to airfield across any part of their area in a day or two, the British had to ship theirs by sea round the Cape, a voyage of three months. Much the same was true of other munitions and

reinforcements. Later, a shorter route was developed across central Africa; but to the end the Germans could always reinforce far more quickly.

Wavell's position in Libya was further weakened by the need for dealing with the huge enemy army in his rear in Italian East Africa. The Fourth Indian Division was detached from the Western Desert to the Sudan, and on 19 January 1941, the Italian colony of Eritrea was invaded by a force based on Khartoum. Concurrently a force based on Nairobi moved against Italian Somaliland; and eventually the two forces met like pincers in the heart of Abyssinia. The Eritrean capital was taken by the northern force on April 1; the Abyssinian by the southern on April 6. The bulk of the Italian and native units were thus destroyed; though mopping up lasted long in some areas, and was not completed till 27 November. The hardest fighting was the storming of Keren by the northern force in March; but the southern, which covered 1,725 miles in 53 days, had also a remarkable record.

In the meantime the Germans had moved a large air force into Sicily and a large tank force into Libya, and in a short while turned the balance against us in those areas. The mobile screen, which was all Wavell could keep in the west of Cyrenaica, was routed; by an unlucky mishap its best generals were captured; and in a very short time the British army was back on the Egyptian frontier, though with a garrison left behind to hold Tobruk. The *Luftwaffe* in Sicily made the Narrows so unhealthy for the British fleet, that even the supplying of Malta became most difficult. The loss of Crete was an aggravation of these troubles. About the same time a military usurper in Iraq came out against the British, and the Germans sent aircraft to help him, which were re-fuelled on the airfields of Vichy-controlled French Syria. Rather surprisingly, as it seemed at the moment, when the British proceeded to put down, first the Iraqi usurper, and then the Vichy

regime in Syria, Germany hardly lifted a finger to save her friends. Free French troops took part in conquering Syria, which was then placed in Free French hands.

At the end of May the Germans made a notable attempt to weaken Britain's Atlantic cordon by sending out as a commerce raider the *Bismarck*, then probably the world's most powerful battleship. Big-ship interception failed, the battle-cruiser *Hood* being sunk and the *Bismarck* escaping. But ocean-going aircraft re-discovered the runaway, and summoned a naval concentration which overwhelmed her. This sea-defeat emphasized Germany's need to use her land-power further if she was to escape strangulation. There were two alternatives—pincers movements through Turkey and North Africa with Suez, the Iraq oilfield, and the Persian Gulf as the objectives; or an attack on Soviet Russia. Hitler had decided for the latter; and at dawn on 22 June 1941 the German armies, joined by Finns, Hungarians, Rumanians, and later Italians, attacked on a front of over 1,000 miles. On the evening of the same day Mr. Churchill, by yet another act of leadership, broadcast a speech which swung Britain unreservedly on to Russia's side, and helped to swing America also.

In fighting Russia the Germans fought for the first time a Power which was ready for them and had its mass production flowing strongly. Their main advantage was that their soldiers from top to bottom were war-experienced, whereas the Russians were novices. Since tactics and strategy had been so recently revolutionized, this advantage was great. It did not see them through, but it saw them a long way. The fringes which Stalin had secured for his frontiers —the Baltic States, Eastern Poland, and Bessarabia— were torn away in gigantic battles; and the invaders pressed deep into the country, reaching and enveloping Leningrad, nearly reaching and enveloping Moscow, capturing Kiev, Kharkov, and the Donetz Basin,

and even Rostov-on-Don; though from the last they were soon ejected. They relied throughout on tanks and aircraft, in each of which they enjoyed qualitative superiority, while the numbers employed on both sides beat all records. Russian supplies were affected by the loss of the industrial Ukraine, but the need was partially met by the war factories of the Urals and by lavish shipments from Britain and America. One of the chief channels for the latter was through Persia; and as a pro-German Shah plotted to obstruct it, British and Russian troops entered the country, and took steps which led to the Shah's abdication.

The Russo–German conflict made for the final widening of the war. On the one hand it brought the United States still closer to the anti-German Powers; on the other, it stimulated the cupidities of Japan. In August 1941 Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt held the first of their meetings, and signed and published the so-called Atlantic Charter. But in July, with Vichy's complicity, Japan had absorbed French Indo–China; and on 7 December without warning she attacked every American and British base within her reach. Four days later both Germany and Italy declared war on the United States. Thus there was no longer any Great Power left neutral.

Japan's start was sensational. At Pearl Harbour, the American naval base in the Pacific, an initial onslaught by her carrier-borne aircraft effected a complete surprise. Two United States battleships were sunk, three disabled, and three heavily damaged, besides extensive damage or destruction of cruisers, destroyers and aircraft. Only three days later the two great British battleships *Prince of Wales* and *Repulse*, having ventured into the Gulf of Siam without fighter escort, were ignominiously sunk by Japanese bombers. These victories gave Japan naval supremacy in Pacific and East Asiatic waters; and she proceeded to exploit it with great vigour against British, Dutch. and

American possessions there. Hardly less important than her strength in ships was her strength in aircraft. In November it had been announced that British aircraft output was now equal to German; so that with American and Russian output added the combined nations were fast winning the lead over the Axis. But advantage had not been taken of it to equip their Asiatic forces. Attempts to hold fortresses and conduct campaigns without aircraft failed disastrously; Hong Kong, Malaya, and Singapore were successively lost in this way; and the Japanese conquered the Dutch East Indies, the rest of Borneo, the Philippines, the Andamans and Burma. They cut the Burma Road and so isolated China. Only as Britain and America brought more aircraft to bear, was Japanese expansion checked—eastward by the battle of the Coral Sea (May 1942) followed in June by that of Midway Island; and westward by the defeat of air attacks on Ceylon. The British occupation of Madagascar—till then under Vichy control—saved a most vital island from going the way of Indo-China.

The entry of America into the war was followed by a steep rise in submarine sinkings, as the U-boats pressed into new and undefended waters like the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea. Despite local improvements this peril grew as a whole throughout 1942; it was not till 1943 that it began to be mastered. A corresponding growth on the Allied side was that of the strategic air attack on Germany. While she mass-produced U-boats, they mass-produced bombers; and gradually, though only so, the destruction of German industrial plants and towns came to weigh substantially in the balances of the war. The annihilating raid on Lübeck (28 March 1942) and the raid of 1,130 bombers on Cologne (30–31 May) each marked an epoch in this respect; though the weight of bombs dropped in them was far less than those achieved in the following year.

The winter of the Japanese disasters and the U-boat

crescendo would have been still more gloomy, if it had not been relieved by the rally of the Russians. Following their recovery of Rostov a severe season set in. The advanced German armies suffered terribly; their men were too thinly clad, and their locomotives cracked with the frost. The Russians took advantage of this to dislodge them from one position after another; and the whole German line seemed tottering, till Hitler assumed personal command and restored confidence. In the upshot the worst threats to Moscow were all removed; but Leningrad, though revictualled across the ice of Lake Ladoga, remained within German gun-range.

Unfortunately when the snow had melted and the thaw dried, the Germans recovered themselves. A Russian offensive against Kharkov (May 1942) was defeated; Sevastopol was taken and the Crimea cleaned up; and having thus cleared their right flank, the German armies struck hard eastward between the Donetz and the upper Don. But at a critical moment in their victorious career they divided their effort. One part turned south, took Rostov, and pushed into the Caucasus aiming for oil; the other moved east and reached the neighbourhood of the Volga at Stalingrad. By thus seeking two objectives they eventually failed of either.

Meantime their victories in Russia were accompanied by victories in North Africa. The story there is chequered. After Wavell was driven back to the Egyptian border in the spring of 1941, he recaptured on 15 May the key position called Halfaya Pass, but lost it again eleven days later. On 1 July he relinquished the command and was succeeded by General Auchinleck, who on 18 November opened another offensive. It relieved Tobruk and on 24 December recaptured Benghazi. But it failed (as Wavell's had) before the lines of El Agheila; and a German counter-offensive threw it back to Gazala in the middle of Cyrenaica. Four months of waiting followed, and then Rommel,

the German commander, attacked. After many days' hard fighting the British force was defeated and chased back into Egypt. Tobruk fell; Wavell's old retiring-limit was passed; and the retreat continued to El Alamein, the last defensive position before Alexandria. The key to the German success—indeed to all their success in Africa—lay in the German Mark IV tank; which down to this point never had to face one which could knock it out at its own range. The British army was saved by its air force, which mercilessly harried the pursuers. Had the Germans reinforced Rommel with aircraft, he would have reached Alexandria. Their omission to do so could only be explained by their not having the aircraft—one of the earliest signs on their side of a definite shortage.

In October with the Germans battering at Stalingrad and threatening Alexandria, the position looked as black as ever. But an offensive launched by Rommel on 31 August had been held. General Alexander, the new commander-in-chief, and General Montgomery, commanding the Eighth Army, were not only able soldiers, but they had a new American tank, the General Sherman, which could knock out the Mark IV. On 2 November it did so on a very large scale, and the Axis army was totally defeated. Four days later the new British and American armies were disembarked in Morocco and Algeria; and thenceforward the initiative in the Mediterranean has rested with the Allies.

The Russian counter-offensive, which saved Stalingrad and eventually destroyed the whole of Germany's Stalingrad army, was launched about 19 November.

These events turned the course of the war. They were made possible, because in output of tanks, aircraft, guns, and material equipment of all kinds the Allies had at last outstripped the Germans. The big handicap, which Hitler had secured for himself before starting, had been worked off. With some delays added by the Japanese intervention, it had taken just over three years to do it.

OXFORD PAMPHLETS ON HOME AFFAIRS
No. H.2

THE NEWSPAPER

BY
IVOR THOMAS

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON : HUMPHREY MILFORD
1943

The sun rises every morning. The newspaper arrives, and the milk. We accept all three almost equally without question. But while the consumer can derive benefits from the sun, and the cow, without understanding them, the products of Fleet Street are more artificial and demand more effort if they are to be useful. This pamphlet is a miniature guide for the newspaper reader. It explains the difference between the various kinds of reading-matter in a newspaper: facts (which are, or should be, sacred), comment (which is free), 'features', and advertisements. It describes how the materials are collected from news agencies, from the newspaper's own correspondents, from free-lance correspondents, from official sources, and so on, and how they are prepared inside the newspaper office. The different types of newspaper are also described, and the varying forms of newspaper ownership. Several important problems are discussed, such as the maintenance of journalistic standards, whether owners run their papers for profit, power, or service, the influence of advertising, and the power of the press to influence public opinion.

The author, Mr. Ivor Thomas, is M.P. for Keighley (Yorks). Before entering Parliament, he spent six years on the editorial staff of *The Times* and three years as chief leader-writer to the *News Chronicle*.

SOME BOOKS

Report on the British Press. Political and Economic Planning. 1938.

Steed, Henry Wickham, *The Press.* 1938. (Penguin Special.)

Stutterheim, Kurt von, *The Press in England.* Translated by W. H. Johnston. 1934.

Cummings, A. J., *The Press.* 1936.

Mansfield, F. J., *The Complete Journalist.* 1935.

Gibbs, Sir Philip, *The Street of Adventure.* 1909.

First published, March 1943

First published in India, December 1943

Printed at the Diocesan Press, Madras, India and published by
THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, *Amen House, E.C.4.*
LONDON EDINBURGH GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO
MELBOURNE CAPETOWN BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS
HUMPHREY MILFORD *Publisher to the University*

History and Prestige of the English Newspaper

THE English newspaper has played a notable part in disseminating information, moulding public opinion, and shaping policy since the reign of Charles I. For centuries it has been both the mirror and the pulse of national life. There still survive, in the full pride of life, newspapers which reported the storming of the Bastille and the victory of Trafalgar; three provincial newspapers which to-day chronicle the doings of Worcester, Nottingham, and East Anglia were first read in the coffee houses of Queen Anne's reign;[1] and the *London Gazette*, though not a newspaper in the ordinary sense of the word, still gravely records the news of the Court as it did when first issued at Oxford in 1665.

The English newspaper is thus an institution with a history and an influence excelled only by the Church, Parliament, the Common Law, and the Crown. In the growth of British democracy the newspaper has been a fighting instrument second to none. But no newspaper can live on its past. Its continued life depends on its ability to maintain circulation, and therewith advertising revenue, in a fiercely competitive world. Not all its long history dating from 1772, nor its finely polished articles, nor its admirable paper and type, nor even its intimate connexion with the Conservative Party, could save the *Morning Post* as an independent newspaper in 1937; it had failed to move with the times and attract sufficient readers. The English newspaper is an excellent example of the principle of the survival of the fittest, where 'fittest' does not necessarily mean 'best,' but implies adaptation to environment. The newspaper which is to survive must be continually adapting itself to changing circumstances. It must be prepared

[1] *Berrow's Worcester Journal* (a weekly founded in 1709 as the *Worcester Postman*) is the oldest surviving non-official newspaper in the British Isles; the *Nottingham Journal*, published as a daily since 1836, is a direct descendant of the *Weekly Courant* founded in 1710; the *Lincoln, Stamford, and Rutland Mercury* was founded in 1712–13 as the *Stamford Mercury*, more than sixty newspapers founded earlier than 1800 are still in existence.

ruthlessly to change its paper, its type, its layout, even its personnel when they have ceased to attract, even its views when they are proved wrong, unless it wishes to be remembered for the chief reason that Queen Anne is herself remembered.

Classes of Newspapers

The British press is divided into five main classes: (1) the national daily newspapers, that is, the daily morning newspapers which have a nation-wide circulation or influence; (2) the London evening newspapers; (3) the provincial newspapers, morning and evening; (4) the local newspapers, that is, the county and suburban weeklies; and (5) the Sunday newspapers. The national daily newspapers are mainly centred in London, but six of them are printed in Manchester as well as in London, and one of the six has also an edition printed in Glasgow. There are two provincial newspapers—the *Manchester Guardian* published in Manchester and the *Yorkshire Post* published in Leeds—which have relatively small circulations, but exert by sheer ability a national influence and must be regarded as national newspapers. If it were not for the physical difficulty of distributing Scottish newspapers in the South of England, the Edinburgh *Scotsman* and the *Glasgow Herald* might call for inclusion in the same class, and there are many other provincial journals knocking for admission. Owing to the short time available for distribution, there cannot be a national evening newspaper, but the three London evening papers are read all over the Home Counties and come nearest to the ideal.

The absence of competition from London gives the evening newspapers published in many places a status comparable with, or even greater than, the local morning newspapers; and several 'high-class' provincial papers have over periods been 'carried' financially by their

evening counterparts, notably the *Manchester Guardian*, *Yorkshire Post*, and *Birmingham Post*. The Sunday newspapers, enjoying the benefit of the long night hours for distribution, are mainly published in London or in London and Manchester,[1] but one with a huge circulation is printed in Manchester only. One of the chief differences between the British and foreign press is that here the daily newspapers appear only from Monday to Saturday; the Sunday newspaper, even when under the same financial control as a daily, is produced by a different staff and distributed by different methods and persons; it has its own set of correspondents; it is also different in its nature, giving more prominence to features and special articles. The evening 'companions' of the morning newspapers have also separate offices and staffs.

Dominance of London

Even this brief sketch will have brought out the dominance of London in the newspaper world. It is a case of London first, Manchester second, and the rest practically nowhere. With the exception of Paris, and perhaps we should add of Moscow, this dominance of London has no parallel in the great countries of the world. In Great Britain, France, and Russia,[2] the press is highly centralized in the capital, and circulations are correspondingly large. In the United States, Germany, and Italy, the press is decentralized, and circulations are normally much smaller. In Great Britain, this dominance of the capital is largely due to the smallness of the country and the admirable railway service, which means that a newspaper printed in London one evening can be on the breakfast table in most parts of England next morning, and can be read before lunch even in remote parts of Wales and Scotland.

[1] The *Sunday Express* in Glasgow also.

[2] Russia is rather different from the other two, as local versions of the all-Union newspapers are printed throughout the Union with some common features.

In London itself the press is also highly centralized, so much so that 'Fleet Street' has become a synonym for the newspaper world. Of the big national newspapers only the *Daily Express* and *Daily Telegraph* actually abut on Fleet Street, but all the big dailies except two are printed in the adjoining streets; and even the *Daily Herald* and *Daily Sketch*, though outside the charmed area which means so much to a newspaper man, are published within a mile. So magical is the name Fleet Street that even newspapers printed only a few yards away feel it necessary to have advertisement offices with a Fleet Street frontage. In this region also are the offices of the news agencies, and the London offices of the provincial newspapers.

Although, as already indicated, the circumstances of publication are favourable to high British circulations, it is at a first glance rather surprising that London newspapers have reached the highest circulations in the world. It might be thought that the United States, with a population of 130,000,000, or the Soviet Union with a population of 180,000,000, would show circulations far in excess of the United Kingdom, with a population of 45,000,000. But density of population is more important than the total from the point of view of distributing newspapers. Before the war the biggest circulations outside the United Kingdom were approximately: *Pravda* (U.S.S.R.), 1,950,000; *Paris-soir* (France), 1,800,000; *New York Daily News* (U.S.A.), 1,718,000; *Osaka Mainichi Shimbun* (Japan), 1,650,000; *Le Petit Parisien* (France), 1,650,000; and *Izvestia* (U.S.S.R.), 1,600,000. Far in excess of the highest of these circulations came the *Daily Express*, about 2,550,000 daily, and the *Daily Herald*, over 2,000,000 daily, also out-topped them all; on Sundays the *People* sold over 3,000,000 copies and the *News of the World* over 4,000,000—easily the largest circulation in the world. To achieve the

distribution of this huge total, the first edition of the *News of the World* has to be put to press on Thursday. The *Express* reached 2,746,855 daily in February 1942.

Types of Newspapers

Though many newspapers have disappeared in recent years, the reader, unless he has special or peculiar tastes, can still find one or more to his liking. The eight big London dailies consist of two 'class' papers—*The Times* (founded 1785) and the *Daily Telegraph and Morning Post*; four 'popular' newspapers with circulations over a million—the *Daily Express*, *Daily Herald*, *Daily Mail*, and *News Chronicle*; and two picture papers—the *Daily Mirror* and *Daily Sketch*. In addition there are two general daily newspapers with a special appeal—the *Morning Advertiser* (founded 1794), which is the organ of the Incorporated Society of Licensed Victuallers, and the *Daily Worker*, which is the Communist Party organ; and the two financial newspapers, the *Financial News* and *Financial Times*, containing some general news.

The *Daily Herald* is the official organ of the Labour Movement and the *Daily Worker* of the Communist Party. The *Daily Worker* is an aggressive political organ, but the *Daily Herald*, having a circulation twenty-five times as great, gives more prominence to general news and features. The *News Chronicle* is the result of the fusion of four former Liberal newspapers; it is independent of the Liberal Party organisation, but expresses the views of the radical element in the party, and, being independent, can often go as far to the Left as the *Daily Worker*. The *Daily Telegraph*, *Daily Mail*, and *Daily Express* describe themselves as Independent Conservative; but the Conservatism is more marked in the *Telegraph* and the Independence in the *Mail* and the *Express*. Without official connexions, but rather by a kind of pre-established harmony, the *Telegraph* generally

expresses the views of the Conservative Central Office. The *Mail* and the *Express* have long reflected the personal and varying views of their proprietors.[1]

Even with its price at threepence, *The Times* is now nearer than at any time in its long history to its ideal of being the national newspaper. The policy of *The Times* in recent decades has normally been Independent Conservative, but with a substantial measure of fair play for the Government of the day, whatever it may be. At the present time, however its policy cannot be identified with any party, but reflects the national mood more exactly than any party or other newspaper.

The *Manchester Guardian* and the *Yorkshire Post* are serious political newspapers with a national influence. Both are independent of national organizations, but the *Guardian* is the last stronghold of the Cobden School of Liberalism and the *Post* expresses ' 'Twixt Trent and Tweed ' a progressive Conservatism.

Politics take a back page in the Sunday newspapers except in *Reynolds News*, the Co-operative organ, and in the two class papers, the *Observer* (founded 1791) and the *Sunday Times*. These two newspapers are chiefly read for their political articles, book reviews, and musical and dramatic notices ; their outlook has been Independent Conservative, but both are going through a period of change in different directions. Their influence is great, but their circulations are tiny compared with those of the *News of the World* and the *People*. On the common assumption of three readers to a copy, these two newspapers must be read by half the British population, and the nature of their appeal is worth a serious social study.

The provincial press, daily and weekly, generally expresses a political attitude—Conservative, Liberal, or occasionally Labour—in its leading articles, but in its

[1] Though it is now rather difficult to say where the ownership of the *Mail* lies.

treatment of news and features is nearly always scrupulously fair to all parties. The local editor has to hold up a mirror to all activities in his area, whatever their political complexion. The local paper is a town's institution like market day.

Ownership of the Press

The British Press shows most conceivable types of ownership. If the *London Gazette* be included, there is one newspaper owned and published by the Crown. Most London newspapers used to be family properties, as many provincial papers still are; there is still a Walter at Printing House Square, as there was in 1785, but the controlling interest in *The Times* since 1922 has been held by Major (now Lt.-Col.) J. J. Astor; the Cadbury family has the controlling interest in the *News Chronicle* and *Star*. Other London newspapers are owned or controlled by individuals, who may in turn found dynasties like the Walters. The *Observer* is owned by Lord Astor (brother of Lt.-Col. Astor), and Lord Beaverbrook has a controlling interest in the *Daily Express*, *Evening Standard*, and *Sunday Express*. The *Daily Mail* and *Daily Mirror* are owned by a changing body of shareholders. The *Daily Herald* is owned as to 49 per cent. of its shares by the General Council of the Trades Union Congress and as to 51 per cent. by Odhams Press Ltd. *Reynolds News* is owned by the Co-operative movement; as its readers are mainly Co-operators it may broadly be said to be owned by its readers. There is to-day no actual example of co-operative-producer ownership; but newspaper staffs have sometimes been invited to subscribe to shares in their own papers—generally when these are sick unto death. The *Daily Worker* though not technically owned by the Communist Party, has been kept in existence largely by the gifts and free services of Communists. The *Morning*

Advertiser is an isolated example of a newspaper owned on behalf of a trade—by the Incorporated Society of Licensed Victuallers.

Newspaper Groups

The chief feature of newspaper finance in the present century has been the growth of combines controlling chains of newspapers. First in time and in the ramifications of its interests[1] is the Harmsworth Group, to which the main inheritance of the two brothers Harmsworth (Viscount Northcliffe and the first Viscount Rothermere) has descended. The principal company is Associated Newspapers Ltd., which owns the *Daily Mail*, *Overseas Daily Mail*, *Sunday Dispatch*, and the London *Evening News*; through subsidiary companies it owns or controls eight provincial evening newspapers and six provincial weeklies; and it has a substantial holding in Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co., Ltd., with which it has an agreement to take all its requirements of newsprint (the paper on which newspapers are printed) until 1958. The group's provincial newspapers are published in Cheltenham, Derby, Gloucester, Grimsby, Hanley, Hull, and Swansea. A very substantial percentage of the capital of Associated Newspapers Ltd. is held by Daily Mail and General Trust Ltd. Viscount Rothermere is chairman of both companies, but his financial interest is not such as to give him control of the newspapers in the group. His father, the late Lord Rothermere, did exercise through personal influence a considerable measure of control over the whole group, especially over the *Daily Mail*; and he also is believed to direct that newspaper fairly closely.

Until 1937 it was accurate to speak of a Berry group controlled by the two brothers, Lord Camrose and

[1] Those interests are not so extensive now as they were a few years ago, when the *Daily Mirror* and *Sunday Pictorial* also belonged to the group. These two financially inter-locked papers are now owned by a continually changing body of shareholders, except for a block of holdings held by banks on behalf of unknown persons; these nominee holdings amount only to a minority interest.

Lord Kemsley, and at one period the group had a fierce competition in the provinces with the Harmsworth group. But in 1937 the two brothers divided their interests. Lord Camrose is now the proprietor and editor-in-chief of the *Daily Telegraph* and controls the *Financial Times*. Lord Kemsley owns or controls one London national morning paper (*Daily Sketch*), three national Sunday papers published in London and Manchester (*Sunday Times*, *Sunday Graphic*, and *Sunday Chronicle*), another national Sunday newspaper published in Manchester (*Empire News*), two less famous Sunday papers, six provincial dailies, seven provincial evening papers, and six provincial weeklies. Lord Kemsley's main provincial interests are in Manchester, Glasgow, Cardiff, Tyneside, Aberdeen, and Sheffield. His control is exercised through Allied Newspapers Ltd., which in turn controls Allied Northern Newspapers Ltd., Associated Scottish Newspapers Ltd., and Daily Sketch and Sunday Graphic Ltd.

Another important chain of provincial newspapers is that owned by Westminster Press Provincial Newspapers Ltd., formerly known as the Starmer Group after its then Managing Director, the late Sir Charles W. Starmer. This group consists of four morning, nine evening, one Sunday, and twenty-eight county weekly newspapers, some of which issue localized editions. The centres of publication are mainly in the Midlands, Yorkshire, and Durham. The Cowdray family has financial control, and the Rowntrees are represented on the board. The policy of the newspapers, stated some years ago, was as follows :—

'That, generally speaking, the associated newspapers should advocate Liberal principles in local and national government, especially Free Trade, League of Nations, Economy, and Social Reform. They seek to advance the Liberal spirit in people and institutions.'

Profit, Power, or Service?

The growing concentration of ownership has led to fears that the British Press will cease to be an organ of public opinion in all its varying moods, and will become the instrument on which one or a few Press Lords will call the tune. The danger is real, but so far remains hypothetical. Not only is there every variety of ownership in the British Press, but there are many forms of relationship between proprietor and newspaper. In the case of the *Daily Herald* it is laid down that the political and industrial policy shall be that of the Labour Party and the T.U.C.; should a dispute arise between the T.U.C. and the other directors, it may be referred to a referee or referees of high legal standing. Lord Beaverbrook, it is true, uses his newspapers as organs of personal opinion, but his intervention is capricious rather than constant; and his puckish nature welcomes even in his own papers articles and cartoons attacking or ridiculing his policies. Lord Camrose takes a keen personal interest in the *Daily Telegraph*, but he is editor-in-chief as well as proprietor. Lt.-Col. Astor, on the other hand, leaves editorial control of *The Times* in the hands of its editor, and some proprietors make it a practice to intervene only on such occasions as a change of editor. Nor can it be generally maintained that the Press to-day is in undesirable hands. The Astors, Cadburys, and Rowntrees, to mention only three instances, can point to a family tradition of public service which fits them as well as anyone to be the guardians of public opinion.

The standard of ownership may not always remain at its present level. To prevent *The Times* from falling into undesirable hands its proprietors have made an arrangement whereby any transfer of shares in The Times Holding Co., Ltd., needs the consent of a body of trustees consisting of the Lord Chief Justice, the Warden of All Souls College, Oxford, the President of the Royal

Society, the President of the Institute of Chartered Accountants, and the Governor of the Bank of England. While such 'self-denying ordinances' on the part of public-minded proprietors are to be welcomed, limits are imposed on an owner's power to do evil by the necessity of retaining readers and advertisers in face of the competition of the B.B.C. and of other newspapers. The value of this restraint has been diminished, however, by the disappearance of so many independent newspapers; and the foundation of new papers in independent hands is greatly to be desired. Unfortunately the cost of producing newspapers has risen so greatly in the present century that the foundation of a new national organ is prohibitive except to the wealthiest individuals or corporations. It is said that over £2,000,000 had to be spent before the *Daily Herald* was firmly established as a national daily. The *Daily Worker* has maintained itself in existence without a large capital, but not on a paying basis. It does, however, show a way which other groups can follow if they have sufficient enthusiasm.

Why are would-be owners willing to risk so much? Is it a desire for profit, or a lust for power, or the motive of service? The profit motive is bound to be a factor in those newspapers owned by the public such as the *Daily Mail* and *Daily Mirror*, but elsewhere it hardly operates. Lt.-Col. Astor bought his holding in *The Times* as an act of public service; Lord Camrose, it is believed, runs the *Daily Telegraph* primarily as a means of influencing public opinion; and though surpluses have been made, they are incidental. Lord Beaverbrook could have made large sums out of his newspapers, but it has been his deliberate policy to use any surplus for development. The case of the Cadbury group is specially interesting. The majority holding in the *News Chronicle* and *Star* is held by a trust, and dividends received by the trust can be used only for developing the existing

newspapers, for improving the conditions of the staff, for founding and acquiring new papers, or for charitable purposes. Of course, the motive of influencing public opinion or furthering personal ambitions can be quite as anti-social as the profit-motive, but it is interesting to notice how small a part is played by the profit-motive to-day in the production of newspapers, and how genuine is the motive of public service. Even where the profit-motive operates, Stock Exchange valuations show that the public regard newspapers as speculative ventures. It is, in fact, far easier to make a loss than a profit out of a national newspaper.

Agencies and Correspondents

The staff of a newspaper office imposes a further limit on the power of proprietors to make changes. Lord Northcliffe never succeeded in moulding the staff of Printing House Square to his will. It is the journalists in the last resort who are the most important element in the production of a newspaper. They attract and retain the readers whom the advertisers wish to reach; it is their work which moulds opinion or shapes policy or provides the proprietors' profits.

Not all newspaper workers are journalists. For every journalist, about nine other workers are needed in the managerial, advertisement, composing, printing, circulation, and distributing staffs. There are two broad divisions of journalists—those who provide the 'copy' and those who prepare it for the press.

A newspaper derives its news from two main sources: it has its own staff of reporters and correspondents, and it shares the services of one or more news agencies with other newspapers. The big news agencies are able to maintain far larger staffs than a newspaper office can do, and they cover all events of importance. The special qualities demanded of news agencies are speed and

trustworthiness. Being intended for many newspapers of contrasted outlook, the reports of news agencies are best when they are colourless and are often bound to be longer than can be printed—so that each newspaper can select according to taste. These reports normally come into the office by means of the tape machine—a teleprinter; and the service is so rapid that the result of a big race, it has been truly said, is known in every newspaper office before the jockeys have had time to dismount.

Six main agencies are used in Great Britain. The *Press Association* provides home news of all types, but does not touch overseas news. It is an association of the provincial newspapers founded in 1870 and governed by a board of seven directors drawn from the member-newspapers; but the London newspapers also subscribe to its services. *Reuters* specializes in overseas news. It was founded by Paul Julius Reuter at Aachen in 1847, but in 1851 its headquarters were moved to London, and in 1865 it was converted into a limited company. There being a danger in 1915 that it might fall into unfriendly hands, Sir Roderick Jones converted it into a private trust. Ten years later the Press Association agreed to accept the ownership of Reuters. The Newspaper Proprietors Association (that is, the society of London proprietors) was not willing at the time to share the ownership, but in 1941 it acquired a half-share in the agency from the Press Association. Reuters is now governed by a board partly nominated by the P.A., partly by the N.P.A., and there is a body of trustees.

The *Exchange Telegraph* is a widely-used British agency providing home and overseas news. *Central News*, founded in 1880, was under American control from 1908 to 1937, but then reverted to British control. The *British United Press* is the British counterpart of the United Press Associations of America. The *Associated Press* is another big American agency which is much

used. In addition there are a number of smaller but useful specialized news agencies.

Newspapers could be wholly produced (several times over in fact) from material supplied daily by the agencies, but newspapers thus produced would differ little from each other and would be so dull as not to be worth buying. Individuality and colour are provided by the newspaper's own staff. This consists in the first place of its full-time reporters at the head office; they work under the News Editor, who gives them each day their assignments. At the head office also are the higher reporters described as correspondents—Political, Diplomatic, Ecclesiastical, Dramatic, and so on—who are given the responsibility for gathering news within a special field; often they enjoy the confidence of the highest persons in the land, and it is necessary not only to read their lines, but between their lines.

A special place of honour, as of responsibility, used to be held by the staff of reporters working in the Press Galleries of Parliament. Nowadays *The Times* is the only newspaper to maintain its own gallery staff; other newspapers depend on agency reports and sketch writers. The Press uses four types of persons to act as channels between Parliament and the public:

(1) the gallery man, who takes a straightforward shorthand note;

(2) the sketch writer, who gives an impression of the debate;

(3) the lobby correspondent, who keeps close contact with Ministers and other Members, and writes about future developments; and

(4) the leader writer, who expresses his newspaper's opinion.

All are necessary in the great work of moulding democratic opinion, but the decline in the straightforward reporting of serious speeches, and the premium put on bright or

startling interventions must give cause for some apprehension.

A staff of reporters is similarly kept at the Law Courts. The law reporters of *The Times* are required to be barristers, and the published volumes of *The Times Law Reports* are accepted as authentic records of judgements.

Under the News Editor there are also correspondents in a large number of provincial towns who normally receive their assignments, and send in their copy, by telegraph and telephone. For overseas news there is a Foreign News Editor who has the oversight of the newspaper's correspondents abroad. Distant messages are sent in by telegram (cable or radio), but messages from European capitals are (or were in peace-time) normally sent over the telephone and taken down in shorthand or by dictaphone. For the chief news centres it is convenient to have a call at a fixed time every evening, supplemented where necessary by special calls. In one office differently coloured lamps in various parts of the building show when Paris, Berlin, Rome or Brussels is ' on the line ' so that interested members of the staff may listen in.

A newspaper's correspondents, whether at home or overseas, may be full-time staff men, and required to work exclusively for the newspaper ; in such cases their messages are described (where the personal name is not used) as ' From Our Own Correspondent'. But correspondents in the less important centres are paid a retaining fee *plus* space rates for so much of their messages as is printed ; such correspondents are free to do other work, and at home they are usually on the staff of a local newspaper ; their messages may be described as ' From Our Correspondent '. When a newspaper sends one of its staff on a special mission, his messages are described as ' From Our Special Correspondent '. A message headed ' From A Correspondent ' indicates that it has

been accepted from an outside contributor; and 'From A Special Correspondent' indicates that an outside contributor has been asked to cover some subject or event for which he has special qualifications. The distinction between staff men and outside contributors is jealously preserved in newspaper offices, for with it go remuneration and status. It has been agreed that no fully qualified reporter or sub-editor, by which is meant a reporter or sub-editor who has served in that capacity for at least three years, shall be paid for exclusive full-time services on a London daily or evening newspaper less than nine guineas a week, plus a war bonus of 7*s.* 6*d.* a week; in the provinces, the minimum salary for a fully qualified reporter or sub-editor is graded from £5 3*s.* 6*d.* to £6 15*s.* a week (inclusive of war bonuses). The outside contributor is paid by space, that is to say, by the number of inches of his copy printed, not by what he writes, or by special commission or by a stipulated fee for each day that he is employed. Frequently the outside contributor is a free-lance journalist making a living by writing for many papers; the life of a free-lance is independent but precarious, and no one should embark upon it without an understanding of its hardships, which are equalled among the professions only by the stage.

Sub-Editors

From all these sources a vast jumble of copy pours into newspaper offices every day—written, typed, printed, telegraphed, or telephoned. It is prepared for the press by sub-editors, who may work together under a Chief Sub-Editor, or, in a large office, are divided into home, foreign, sporting, and city. Their work consists of selection, compression, correction of fact, and improvement of style, the translation of telegraphese into English, elucidation where necessary, the choice of type, and the writing of headings. The selection among the copy is

done by a copy-taster, who discards some by putting it on 'the spike' and passes the remainder to his colleagues with a hasty assessment of its importance, *e.g.* in the form of a letter or number indicating the type of heading it is to receive; the selection within the copy itself is done by the sub-editor, who passes the sub-edited copy to the Chief Sub-Editor for approval or revision. The sub-editor's work is the most exacting and exasperating (and not the least important) in a newspaper office; it calls for a combination of speed, accuracy, and encyclopædic knowledge, together with a flair for news. In the nature of the case there is tension between correspondents (or reporters) and sub-editors, for the sub-editors deplore the verbosity of correspondents, while the correspondents weep to see their best passages slashed.

Features and Leaders

A newspaper, however, does not consist solely of news. An increasingly large place in the modern newspaper is taken by 'features.' One of the oldest and most distinctive features of British newspapers is the correspondence column. Letters to the editor of *The Times* are a unique feature in journalism. In the form of letters, the editor of that journal frequently receives free contributions for which other newspapers would gladly pay large sums. Other features of *The Times* are its authoritative 'turnover article,' so called because in peace-time it began on the middle right-hand page and ended on the back of that page; and its obituary notices, generally prepared by expert hands long before the need for use. Most newspaper offices keep a large 'graveyard,' as the stock of obituary notices is irreverently called.

While not ignoring these features, other newspapers make a speciality of features which the austere guardians of *The Times* have hitherto avoided. In the *Daily*

Telegraph, whose letters and special articles are second in influence only to those of *The Times*, a place of honour is held by the daily paragraphs of social and political gossip which appear over the pseudonym 'Peterborough'. The columnist is now gaining in this country a position equal to that which he holds in the United States. Most newspapers now have columnists, who generally exhibit a marked individuality of style and have a wide following. The cartoon is another popular innovation; it may be political, or light, or tell a story in the form of a 'strip' of pictures. The cartoonists are allowed a surprisingly free pen, and their political comment is often worth columns of leading articles.

Apart from news and features, a newspaper must have its leading articles. In the popular newspapers, it may be suspected that these, like the human appendix, are an obsolete survival and to-day exist only because that part of the paper has always been devoted to opinion. The space allowed to them is usually too short for an argument to be properly developed. But in the high-class papers, especially *The Times*, *Telegraph*, *Manchester Guardian*, and *Yorkshire Post*, the leaders are still written with care. Indeed, the leading articles of *The Times* are studied by Governments throughout the world, and sometimes have an effect far greater than was intended by their authors, *e.g.* that of 7 September 1938, suggesting the possibility of a settlement between Czechoslovakia and Germany through the agreed cession of the Sudetenland. In the British Press, leading articles are unsigned because they express, not the views of an individual, but the policy of the paper.

Pictures and Advertisements

An important development of the twentieth century is the provision of pictures as a complement to news and features. After some hesitation, the high-class papers

followed the lead of the popular papers in this respect, and the picture-department is now one of the most highly developed sides of a newspaper office. A newspaper keeps a large library of photographs, and in addition photographers, like reporters, are liable to be sent at a moment's notice on special assignments, in which they always display skill, sometimes audacity, and often courage.

The news, features, leaders, and pictures comprise the editorial elements in a newspaper. While these are being prepared, the advertisement staff is filling its side of the paper. One of the most necessary tasks in a newspaper is to preserve a proper balance between the space allotted to advertisements and that assigned to editorial matter. In peace-time, the amount of advertising matter received determines the number of pages in the paper; in war-time, with limited paper supplies, it is necessary to ration advertisements. British newspapers attempt to preserve a rigid distinction between advertisements and editorial matter, and the two staffs are quite distinct. But puffs of advertised articles will occasionally appear in the editorial columns, and sometimes the advertisements—*e.g.* the social and financial announcements in *The Times*—contain news of wide interest.

Journalistic Standards

There are not more than 10,000 journalists in Great Britain, of whom about 7,000 are members of the National Union of Journalists and 3,000 are members of the Institute of Journalists; some are members of both and some of neither. The Institute, incorporated by a Royal Charter, admits editors and journalist-proprietors (in their capacity as journalists) to its membership, whereas the N.U.J. frowns upon them. (London owners are organized in the Newspaper Proprietors Association, and provincial owners in the Newspaper Society.) Both

the N.U.J. and the Institute are trade unions in different senses of the phrase. But the N.U.J. is affiliated (through its membership of the Printing and Kindred Trades Federation) to the Trades Union Congress whereas the Institute aims at making Journalism a profession analogous in its standards to the Bar or Medicine. The N.U.J. aims at 'the closed shop', *i.e.* it would like to see membership of the N.U.J. compulsory in every newspaper office: the Institute has promoted a Bill for the statutory registration of journalists.

The maintenance of professional standards in journalism is not less vital than in the other professions. A careless doctor may poison one person, but a careless or malicious correspondent can poison the minds of millions and embitter the relations of countries. In matters of personal integrity the British journalist is admittedly above reproach. Unlike some of his continental colleagues, he cannot be bribed directly, and is seldom caught by the indirect bribery of expensive luncheons, flattery, and so on. What he puts into the paper, or leaves out, is dictated solely by journalistic considerations of which the greatest is news-value, and a sense for what constitutes news is the journalist's greatest gift.

The first duty of a newspaper is to give the news and give it quickly. That duty is discharged by the British Press with admirable technical skill. The only major suppression of news in recent years was the action of newspapers for some months in making no mention of King Edward VIII's friendship with Mrs. Ernest Simpson; but this was a spontaneous action by each newspaper without pressure or agreement. The London Press also avoids the so-called cardinal sin of journalism —it is never dull. But speed and brightness do not always conduce to accuracy; and misleading reports, misleading headings, and even downright errors are commoner to-day than good journalists would wish.

Moreover, is all the news 'fit to print'? A few years ago justifiable complaints were made against certain journals with aggressive news-gathering policies for their 'intrusion into private grief'. There are also journals to-day, especially Sunday organs with huge circulations, which probe with unnecessary zeal into the more sordid proceedings of the Courts.

It is not correct to say that the Press has been degraded by Northcliffe's new journalistic methods. Class journalism to-day has an aggregate circulation greater than ever before, and its quality has not diminished. The popular press caters for a reading community which did not exist in the nineteenth century, a community brought into existence by compulsory education. But the controllers of the popular press have not kept pace with the gradual rise in the level of knowledge and taste throughout the community. 'Sport, crime, and women' is still the mixture as formerly prescribed, except for an added dash of astrology. The success of such periodicals as *Picture Post* shows that the public will respond to something better. Slowly, but surely, universal elementary education, and the great expansion of secondary education, are beginning to raise the general level of intelligence and criticism throughout the community. The B.B.C. realizes it; the publishers of the Penguin and similar editions realize it; a fortune awaits the newspaper proprietor who realizes that public taste has gone up, not down, since Northcliffe's day.

Influence of Advertising

A charge often heard is that advertisers exert great influence over editorial matter. It gains plausibility from the well-known fact that newspapers look to advertising for a great part of their revenue; popular newspapers draw about half of their revenue from advertisements, and class newspapers three-quarters or more.

Against this may be set the fact that newspapers which used to carry advertisements on the front page—a highly remunerative position—have one by one given it to news. The *Daily Telegraph*, *Daily Mail*, *Sunday Times*, and *Observer* have all done so in recent years. To-day *The Times*, the *Manchester Guardian*, and the *Morning Advertiser* are the only national papers giving the whole front page to advertisements.

It is difficult to find evidence of direct attempts by advertisers to influence editorial matter. Dr. Max Grunbeck declares, 'When Lord Rothermere's papers gave vigorous support for a time to the Fascist movement in England, their initiative was throttled in a few weeks by their advertising department.' If this were true, it might be an argument for control through advertising. Organized pressure is sometimes said to have been exercised by certain trades through a threat to withdraw advertisements. The indirect influence of advertising is more subtle and more extensive. A newspaper that receives a large revenue from company prospectuses may have an unconscious bias in favour of our present financial system; and the paper carrying frequent advertisements of patent medicines may, without any conscious deviation from rectitude, give too little weight to the medical profession's views on such goods. A famous editor has, indeed, written unashamedly of 'such needless folly as putting the report of a fatal motor smash alongside of a motor advertisement'. But examples of deliberate refusal to be influenced can be cited on the other side, such as leading articles supporting the Coal Bill, 1938, notwithstanding advertisements in a contrary sense inserted in the same issue by the mineowners.

The famous 'safe milk' advertisement of the British Medical Association introduces a different principle. It is a salutary principle of newspapers not to admit 'knocking' advertisements, that is, copy which attacks

other advertised goods, because such copy tends to discredit all advertising. When the B.M.A. in 1938 began a campaign against milk that was not tuberculin-tested or pasteurized, it applied to the newspapers for space for an advertisement headed, 'Is All Milk Safe?' The Newspaper Proprietors' Association objected to the form of the advertisement, partly on the grounds that it 'knocked' the advertisements of the milk industry, but also on grounds of public policy, as being likely to cause panic and prejudicial to the national milk campaign. In the end the B.M.A. agreed to modify the offending features of the advertisement, and in its modified form it was printed by most of the London dailies.

These examples show that while direct control by advertisers might become dangerous, the danger is hypothetical. It must be remembered that there are limits to what an advertiser can do. If he withdraws his advertisements, he not only hits the newspaper but hits himself. And what are the alternatives? In France, where advertising revenue is low, the newspapers have often been forced to rely on subsidies from powerful interests, from their own government or even from foreign governments. As the other source of a newspaper's revenue is sales, it might be thought that the remedy lies in increased circulation. But this can never be wholly true, because newsprint is normally the biggest item in the cost of a newspaper[1], and the cost of newsprint per copy is substantially the same for a million copies as for 100,000—for each copy contains the same amount of paper. In any case, nothing does so much to lower the tone of a newspaper as the scramble for big circulation. In matters of policy, a popular newspaper

[1] Between 30 and 40 per cent. for a popular newspaper, see the interesting figures for the *Daily Express* and two hypothetical dailies given in the P.E.P. *Report on the British Press*, pp. 72–76. The alternatives here presented between advertising revenue and sales revenue is not meant to be pressed, as a higher circulation enables advertising rates to be put up, and the main object of the circulation war was to obtain high net sales certificates to impress advertisers.

inevitably tries to please everybody and offend none; in matters of taste, it tends to follow the conversational rule of Sir Robert Walpole—'to talk bawdy, so that everyone can join in'. The 'circulation war' a few years ago led to a deplorable lowering of the tone of the popular press and the introduction of a host of unjournalistic practices—free insurance, gifts of books, and wholesale canvassing for new readers. The cost of these practices was a heavy burden to newspapers: it was commonly put at a guinea a head, but this was probably an understatement, and some provincial newspapers paid as much as £8 a head for additional readers. While this 'circulation war' raged, some wit pointed out how appropriate it was that the patron saint of journalists should be St. Francis de Sales!

Power of the Press

This raises the whole question of the power of the Press to influence public opinion. A newspaper which makes circulation its main object inevitably tends to supply its readers with what they want, or with what the newspaper thinks they want; otherwise they may take their pennies elsewhere. Thus the *Daily Express* appeared throughout 1938 and as late as July 1939 with the slogan, 'There will be no European war involving Britain this year, or next year either'. It retained its readership, but the *Daily Mail*, which for a time advocated the unpopular cause of authoritarianism lost several hundred thousand readers in the process. It is a source of perpetual debate in the Labour movement whether the *Daily Herald* is a more effective political organ to-day than when its circulation was a tenth of its present size. The *News Chronicle* makes a feature of the British Institute of Public Opinion (Gallup Survey), and it is curious how closely what the paper advocates approximates to what the public wants (as shown by the Survey).

An effective test of the power of the popular press came in 1930–31 when the whole Beaverbrook and Rothermere Press challenged Mr. (now Lord) Baldwin's leadership of the Conservative Party; Mr. Baldwin won a complete victory against the 'engines of propaganda for the constantly changing policies, desires, personal wishes, personal likes and personal dislikes of two men'.[1]

The power of the Press to influence opinion and policy is, in fact, almost in inverse proportion to circulation, though the rule is not mathematically exact. *The Times* has great influence on policy, because its readers are nearly all centres of influence or in a position to shape policy—members of the legislature, the executive, and the judicial profession, teachers and clergy, local government officials, and so on. The *Daily Telegraph* is a power in the Conservative Party; its revolt against 'appeasement' was a significant stage in the abandonment of that policy. The *Manchester Guardian*, with a circulation of about 60,000, is quietly turned over in many minds that control events. The *Yorkshire Post* set in motion the events leading up to the abdication of King Edward VIII; yet its circulation at the time was not more than 35,000.

News and Views

In theory all British newspapers make a rigid distinction between news and comment. The newspaper's own views are to be found day by day in the same place in the paper, and the accepted ideal is that of C. P. Scott, the great editor of the *Manchester Guardian*: 'Comment is free, but facts are sacred'. In practice, however, there is no such thing as complete objectivity in the presentation of news. The position on the page, the choice of type and lay-out, and the headlines will differ according to the outlook of the persons responsible for them. Sometimes

[1] Speech quoted in *The Times*, 18 March 1931. It was at this time that the *mot* went round Fleet Street, 'Mr. Baldwin has resigned and Lord Beaverbrook has sent for the King'.

this personal element distorts the basic report, but the distortion is more often unconscious than conscious. Critics are apt to attribute to deliberate malice what is more probably due to the speed at which newspaper staffs work. Brighter methods in the presentation of news have come to stay and have influenced even the more sober journals. They are not in themselves evil: it was just as wrong of *The Times* to report the battle of Waterloo in the bottom of the right-hand column without a heading as it was for the *Sketch* and *Mirror* on 12 February 1938 to 'splash' all over their front page an earl's hunting accident.

Effect of the War

The war brought great changes to newspapers. The Ministry of Information was immediately set up, and acts as a clearing house for the transmission to newspapers of Government news—which in war-time means some of the most important news. Its large hall in Bloomsbury, where most newspapers keep a representative by day and many by night, is the biggest press club in the world. The Ministry, through its Press and Censorship Bureau, also acts as a censor of news received by newspapers from other sources. Newspapers are under no obligation to submit news before publication, but as they would expose themselves to penalties for publishing news of certain types, they take the opinion of the Bureau in all doubtful cases. Comment is not submitted to the Censor. After many early cases of friction, the system is now working as well as any system of censorship can be expected to work.

From the reader's point of view, the most important change has been a reduction in the supply of newsprint to about 20 per cent. of pre-war consumption. The fall of Norway cut off a major source of supply. In order to meet the new position, the chief proprietors formed the

Newsprint Supply Company, which bought some ships of its own and also used existing ships to bring newsprint and pulp from Canada; and the salvage of paper for re-pulping has been developed to a high degree. Newspapers have met the cut in newsprint mainly by a cut in the number of pages, but partly also by a smaller page and thinner paper, and by a reduction in circulation through refusing to accept 'returns' from newsagents. Various ruses, such as more columns to the page and smaller type, have been used to eke out space. The reduced size has meant a corresponding rationing of advertisements and an increase in advertising rates, which has helped to meet the vastly increased cost of newsprint. The need to limit circulation has made it possible for newspapers to drop canvassing and free insurance schemes, and other unjournalistic features, such as competitions, have been much reduced. On the reader's side, the eighteenth-century habit of sharing newspapers has been revived.

It would not be possible to cut the size of newspapers further without destroying their character as newspapers, and any new reduction in supplies of newsprint could be met only by a reduction in sales. This would mean a serious interference with the freedom of the printed word, for the public demand cannot be met even to-day, and a further cut in sales would mean that many people would not be free to read the news and views of their choice. In the interests of the democratic way of life for which we are fighting, the maintenance of supplies of newsprint, with the present figure as an irreducible minimum, deserves to be made a point of national policy.

The reduction in size, allied with the return of so many overseas correspondents, has enabled newspapers to yield many of their younger staff to the Services; and many newspaper men are also serving as war correspondents or photographers with the Forces, sharing all

the dangers of the serving-man's life. War-time newspapers go to press several hours earlier than in peace-time. Several offices suffered from bombing, but in each case the next issue appeared without the readers being aware that anything was unusual. It is remarkable that in over three years of war no British newspaper has failed to appear through enemy action.

The one casualty has been of a different order. Defence Regulation 2D authorizes the Home Secretary to suppress a paper that systematically publishes matter calculated to foment opposition to the successful prosecution of the war. The *Daily Worker*, which began by applauding the war against Hitlerism, decided within a few weeks that this was an imperialist war, and on 21 January 1941, it was suppressed. The German attack on the Soviet Union has subsequently convinced the editorial board that the war is not imperialist, and the ban was lifted on 26 August 1942; publication was resumed on 7 September. A warning that the Regulation might be applied was given to the *Daily Mirror* in March 1942, and provoked heated debate, as it appeared to some people that the only offence of the *Mirror* was to have criticized the Government too strongly.

Press and Government

As the community becomes more planned, the relationship of the newspapers with the Government is likely to give rise to many problems. In early days British newspapers, including *The Times*, accepted subsidies from the Government, and the Government called the tune. The independence which they achieved in the early nineteenth century has not since been lost and is the greatest safeguard of the democratic way of life. But the freedom of the Press had been threatened even in peace-time. The Official Secrets Acts, unknown to our grandfathers, have been stretched beyond their

purpose by the executive, and the Incitement to Disaffection Act of 1934 makes it possible to proceed against a newspaper, not for an offence which it has committed, but for an offence which it may commit.

Among the links between the Government and the Press to-day are the Public Relations Officers maintained by the departments. They are a recent development and fulfil a useful function by giving newspapers an early explanation of the significance of official announcements. But the danger that the independence of the Press may be sapped through this connexion is obvious; it is only a small step from advice to instruction, but that step is all the way from a free to a totalitarian press. Moreover, the Public Relations Officers have sometimes regarded their main job as the 'boosting' of their Minister, while the 'hand out', that is, the prepared statement handed to the Press, kills good journalism. The Foreign Office sets a model to other Ministries in this respect. Its News Department holds daily conferences with Diplomatic Correspondents, either individually, or in small groups; and the material obtained depends largely on the correspondent's skill in putting the right questions and on the confidence which his handling of material inspires. From the newspaper side, a safeguard is to maintain as many alternative sources of news as possible, and especially a highly-qualified staff of correspondents overseas. There is room for much improvement in the overseas representation of the Press. No complaint can be made against *The Times*, which maintains an unequalled organization of overseas correspondents. But too many editors think that any crime reporter is good enough to send abroad, without any previous understanding of the country to which he is sent. It needs to be realized that the representative of a newspaper in a foreign capital holds a post equal in responsibility to the diplomatic representatives; he is, in fact, an ambassador

from a people to a people, not from a government to a government. In justice, it should be added that, despite the haphazard way in which they have been selected, the overseas correspondents come out of the stern test of the past twenty years much better than the diplomatists. Led by such men as Mr. Norman Ebbutt of *The Times*, they were prompt to realize the unappeasable nature of Hitlerism; and there is now no harm in revealing that Mr. Churchill's denunciation of appeasement was in great part based on the private warnings of newspaper men.

The relationship of the Press to the B.B.C. is an allied problem, for the B.B.C., while given considerable day-to-day liberty, is in the last resort a Government instrument. The Press is to-day jealous of the B.B.C., and especially of any favouritism in the matter of Government news, it would also oppose the further development of an independent service of news correspondents by the B.B.C. (at present the B.B.C. has some correspondents of its own, and also relays or re-broadcasts messages from American radio correspondents, but it is still mainly dependent on the news agencies). But considered simply as agencies of information, apart from their relationship to the Government, the interests of the Press and the B.B.C. are not inimical. The hearing of an item in the B.B.C. news often leads to a desire to see it more fully presented, and commented upon, perhaps with pictures, in the next morning's paper. The Press is perhaps unduly suspicious of this great new source of information.

OXFORD PAMPHLETS ON HOME AFFAIRS
No. H.1

HOW BRITAIN IS GOVERNED

BY
R. B. McCALLUM

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
1943

THIS pamphlet describes the institutions and methods by which Great Britain is governed. It shows the development of royal and parliamentary government and how a constitutional system can be based on monarchy and at the same time controlled by universal suffrage. The relations between the United Kingdom and the other parts of the Commonwealth are not discussed here, nor is there space to describe what tasks our government performs. The pamphlet explains the relations between Crown, Ministers, Parliament and people, examines the variations that exist between the different parts of the Kingdom and how the party system works in effecting the will of the electors.

Mr. R. B. McCallum is a native of industrial Clydeside, a graduate of Oxford and of Princeton University, U.S.A. He has been for seventeen years a Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford, and has been engaged in the teaching of history and political science. He is the author of a life of Asquith, Prime Minister 1908-16.

First published March 1943
First published in India November 1943

Printed at the Diocesan Press, Madras, India and published by
THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, *Amen House, E.C.4.*
LONDON EDINBURGH GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO
MELBOURNE CAPETOWN BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS
HUMPHREY MILFORD *Publisher to the University*

HOW BRITAIN IS GOVERNED

Monarchy

THE Government of Great Britain is in the form of a monarchy. It has always been so. Only for eleven years of irregular government under Cromwell and his supporters has any other form been known. To be governed by a hereditary ruler has been the most common experience of the greater part of the human race throughout recorded history. It must therefore be supposed to be the most natural form of government. Twelve of the states of Europe at the present day are monarchies. Of the United Nations, seven are monarchies or, if we count the self-governing Dominions, eleven. Of the Axis powers five have a monarchical form of government.

No visitor to Britain can fail to observe the forms and style of monarchy wherever he goes. Letters are transmitted by the Royal Mail; any disorder, from a public-house scuffle to a great riot, is a breach of the King's peace; criminals are arrested in the King's name, sentenced by his authority, and pardoned by his grace. If an enemy state makes war on us his forces encounter the ships of the Royal Navy, the guns of the Royal Artillery, the tanks of the Royal Armoured Corps, and the aircraft of the Royal Air Force. There is another thing to notice about our monarchy. It is very old. No other royal house in Europe can surpass it in the antiquity and continuity of its descent. Our present King is descended from the early Saxon Kings of Wessex and from the first Kings to rule over all Scotland. Alfred the Great and the King Duncan of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* are his undoubted ancestors. The great royal houses of Europe, the Bourbons, the Hapsburgs, the Hohenzollerns, the Romanoffs have risen and fallen, our royal house rose before them and has continued after them. What is the reason for this astonishing power of survival?

Partly it may be due to the fact that Britain is an island, like Japan, and free from many forms of external pressure,

still more is it due to certain qualities in our kings, and in our people. The Kings of England have never exercised an absolute power nor their subjects known a complete subjection. As far back as the fourteenth century the French chronicler Froissart wrote, with exaggeration, that "the King of England must needs obey his people and do all their will." A hundred years later an English judge, Fortescue, said that while other countries like France were to be described as a Royal Dominion, England was something different and better, a Dominion Royal and Political. By this he meant that there was in England a habit of consultation and a means of restraint in government. This consultation and restraint, as we know, was and is exercised by Parliament. Parliaments were not an exclusively English invention. In the middle ages most states in Europe had them in some form or another. In some countries, such as Sweden, they have a tradition almost as continuous; but because England was greater, richer, and more powerful, it is the English Parliament that has become the chief copy and example.

Constitutional Government

So far as the mere forms of law go, the King in this country summons and dissolves parliaments, appoints and dismisses ministers, makes treaties and declares war and peace. Yet we know that in fact the King does not rule the country. The laws are made and the taxes voted by Parliament. The executive acts of government, the making and conducting of a war and the concluding of a treaty of peace, are performed by the Prime Minister and the Cabinet. The cabinet ministers are men acceptable to the people, not chosen directly like the American President or Governors of States, but approved by the majority of the people's representatives in the House of Commons, who are assumed, and we shall later on discuss how far the assumption is true,

to speak the people's will. The people of England therefore claim that they are free to govern themselves and at the same time to enjoy all that is valuable in the splendour and symbolism of monarchy. They do not feel themselves to be less free because they have a king, but most of them would feel that their life as a community would lose in colour and stability if they had a king no longer.

For the monarchy in this country does give stability to the government. It means that one of the great questions, what is to be the form of government, is settled. Whatever else we may dispute about we need not fight about that. But because we live under a constitutional monarchy there are many things we can dispute about freely and safely. In the last hundred years or so this country has changed from being an aristocracy to a democracy. It might be thought that if this is so we need not consider the past in explaining how Britain is governed. But some of the essential facts of our constitution were settled long ago, in 1688. This was the year of the English Revolution, which we call the 'glorious' revolution, glorious not because it was long and bloody like the American, French, and Russian Revolutions, but because it was swift and bloodless. The people of England expelled King James II because he ruled in defiance of the laws, and they took, as King and Queen, William, Prince of Orange, and Mary his wife, the daughter of James. Two great acts of parliament known as the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement, laid down the fundamental bases of our rights. The King could not suspend and alter laws which parliament had made; he could not raise taxes without parliament's consent nor have a standing army in time of peace unless parliament approved. He could not imprison subjects without trial nor dismiss judges once they had been appointed. It is true that the King could still choose his own ministers, that the House of Lords was left almost equal powers with the Commons and

that the House of Commons was elected by a small part of the whole populace and therefore might not represent them. If democracy means equality, we were worlds away from reaching it. But if it means freedom of the individual, then many essential points had been established by the time King William died in 1702.

After the last war it was the fashion to take these mere civil and individual liberties for granted, as something won beyond dispute; it remained only to press on to social and economic liberties. We know now that this confidence was false. In this war we are fighting for them again. President Roosevelt's catalogue of freedoms includes new goals for humanity made possible by the great wealth of modern society. But it includes also the old freedoms, which we secured under William III and the Americans under Washington.

Divisions of the Country. Wales

In considering the government of Great Britain we must consider exactly what is governed. It is not merely England, although England has 38 million out of the 47 million inhabitants of this country or the 70 millions of white population of the whole British Commonwealth. From the point of view of law and administration the United Kingdom is divided into three parts: (1) England and Wales; (2) Scotland; (3) Northern Ireland. All three are under the sovereignty of Parliament or, to put it more correctly, the King-in-Parliament, but there are important variations in their law and government.

Wales is not quite in the same system as England. The Anglican church there has been disestablished, there is a special department of education for Wales, and a Welsh committee in the House of Commons for all Welsh Bills. In spite of these comparatively small variations in government the Welsh remain very much a nation with their own

language taught in the schools and used in the home. Wales was conquered by Edward I (1272–1307) and brought completely into the English governmental system by Henry VIII (1509–1547). In the eighteenth century it was swept by the great Methodist revival of Wesley and Whitefield and the majority of the people left the Anglican communion and founded their own chapels. There they learned to exercise their wonderful gift of singing and preaching, and nurtured a keen democratic community life, which in some ways has more in common with the Dominions and the United States than with Southern England. The Welsh are acutely conscious of their nationality and a stranger to this country who addresses them as English will not be well-received.

Scotland

Scotland has many variations from England and, like the Welsh, the Scots are a distinct nation. Overseas, an impression is common that Scotland, like Ireland and Wales, was a conquest of England. This is not so. It is truer to say that Scotland inherited England. In the year 1603 the King of Scotland, James VI, became heir to the English crown on the death of Queen Elizabeth. One of his predecessors on the throne of Scotland had married with the English House of Tudor and so he succeeded (as James I) when the Tudor line died out. For a century Scotland and England remained separate governments under one king. In 1707, by an act of wise and far-sighted statesmanship, the English government admitted Scotland to a full union under terms sufficiently generous to be accepted by that proud people. Since then there has been one parliament and one government for the two nations. But the Scots preserved what they most valued, their presbyterian church and their own system of law. In England the King is the governor of the Church; "in all causes

ecclesiastical as well as temporal supreme." In Scotland there is indeed an established church, but its lofty theology concedes no more to the King than the place of " First Civil Magistrate." In England the King appoints the bishops, in Scotland he cannot even nominate the minister of the parish which contains Balmoral Castle. Scottish Law differs in many important respects from English law. It has been much more influenced by Roman Law, its provisions dealing with land, inheritance, and marriage being different from English law. Court practice is also different. More use is made of professional stipendiary magistrates (sheriffs). A Scottish jury need not be unanimous and can bring in a third verdict ' not proven ' if the logic of facts requires it. Such intellectual compulsions are not supposed to trouble English juries. Scotland is ruled through a cabinet minister, the Secretary of State for Scotland, at the head of a Scottish Office, part of which is in Westminster and part in Edinburgh. He answers questions on Scotland in the House, presents the Scottish estimates of expenditure and sponsors Scottish legislation before a Scottish committee.

Northern Ireland

Northern Ireland is the most clearly separate of the divisions of the United Kingdom. It comprises six of the nine counties of the old Irish Province of Ulster. The majority of its inhabitants are protestants of Anglo-Scottish descent. In 1914 they were prepared to resort to arms rather than live under an Irish Nationalist government in Dublin. After the war their right of self-determination was recognised and they were excluded from the Irish Free State when it received dominion status. Northern Ireland is in a position similar to a Canadian province. It returns members to the national parliament at Westminster and contributes to defence and common purposes. But it has its own parlia-

ment and government. There is a Governor, a Prime Minister and Cabinet, and a legislature of two houses. It has its own High Court which administers English Common Law in so far as legislation has not altered it for Irish purposes. From the High Court at Belfast, as from the Court of Session at Edinburgh, appeals can be taken to the House of Lords at Westminster.

It is in Northern Ireland that the United Kingdom has its only land frontier. It is a frontier which presents most of the problems and difficulties of the frontiers of Central Europe about which the British and Americans are apt to complain as causes of needless friction. The frontier of Ulster has almost none of the qualities of a good frontier. It is not a national frontier for in the two counties of Fermanagh and Tyrone on the Ulster side there are rather more Irish Nationalists than Protestant Ulstermen. It is not a good geographical frontier for it comes south of the water-barrier of Lough Erne, and it approaches but does not reach the sea at Donegal Bay. It merely follows old county boundaries which had no relation to economics, strategy, or population. But as with many other artificial frontiers, use and wont may make it work. Northern Ireland is the only part of the kingdom where there is any serious attempt at devolution of the function of government to provincial legislatures. The experiment in many ways has worked well, but it is of less value for comparison because one party, the Unionist, Protestant, or Orange party, is permanently in power while the Catholic, Nationalist, or Irish party is hostile to the whole conception of an Ulster state.

The Sovereign Parliament

But over every part of the United Kingdom the Parliament of Westminster is sovereign and any statute "enacted by the King's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice

and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and the Commons" prevails over any other enactment whether by a subordinate legislature or an ordinance by the Crown alone. It prevails also over any preceding act of parliament, as is shown by the fact that the present parliament, elected in 1935 and due by the Act of 1911 to be dissolved in 1940, has been continued by its own authority. There is no way by which the people can recall or dissolve a Parliament. Only the King has that power. He exercises it on the advice of the Prime Minister. This may be a Prime Minister securely in office who may decide on a good moment at which to dissolve, or a new Prime Minister who wants to give the electors a chance of supporting him with a large majority. It might happen that after more than one election no party could form a government with a secure majority. Then the King, rather than grant a dissolution to some political leader, might refuse to dissolve and might tell the leading statesmen of the various parties that they must find some way of agreeing to carry on the government.

The King

As we have seen, the most fundamental executive powers are vested in the Crown and exercised by ministers. Additional powers are given by statute to individual ministers, such as the emergency powers of detaining persons without trial at present exercised by the Home Secretary. The nature, quality, and direction of government depends entirely on who these ministers are. It is the King who in the first place chooses the Prime Minister and thus sets in motion the process of forming a government. Very often he has no real choice in the matter. One government has resigned and another party is called in. That party has an acknowledged leader and therefore he must be summoned. Sometimes, especially when the Prime Minister dies or retires through ill-health, the King has freedom of choice.

This happened in 1923 when King George V passed over the experienced and unpopular Lord Curzon and chose the popular and inexperienced Mr. Baldwin. It is not of course certain that the statesman summoned by the King will succeed in forming a government. The other members of the party may refuse to serve under him. But the odds are that he will succeed. He has the King's commission, and for a colleague to refuse to serve under him when he has recently been serving with him seems very much like sulking. The man who refuses to serve, unless he has a very good reason based on different ideas of policy, may be thought disloyal to his party and undutiful to his sovereign.

The Prime Minister

Armed with the King's command to form a government, the Prime Minister must distribute the principle ministries within a period of about forty-eight hours. In this short time he may take decisions more important than any he has to take afterwards. A bad appointment to a key position like the Foreign Office or the Air Ministry may cause untold harm, while another appointment may turn out to be a brilliant success. The Prime Minister is not altogether free in his appointments. The foremost leaders in his party or coalition of parties must be given a place somewhere. Occasionally a very important politician may demand a certain office, the Exchequer or the Foreign Office, and refuse to serve unless he is satisfied. The making of a cabinet is a delicate and difficult matter calling for good judgment, firmness, and tact. After the principal ministers have been appointed each has to be provided with an under-minister. These posts are filled usually by younger members of parliament whose chances of further promotion depend on their performance in subordinate office. The ministers too must be distributed over both Houses of Parliament, the majority nowadays being in the Commons. The

Chancellor of the Exchequer must be in the Commons since that House monopolises financial business. The Lord Chancellor, who is also the highest judge in the realm, must be in the Lords for he is the president of that house. When he has completed his task the Prime Minister submits his list of appointments to the King for his approval and it is then made public.

When the Cabinet is formed the Prime Minister must secure the assent of the other ministers to his policies, but he remains the leader of the Cabinet, of the House of Commons, and, if he was not so already, becomes the leader of the party. He is Chairman of the Cabinet, summons it to meet and lays down its agenda with the help of the cabinet secretariat which has existed since 1916. If a minister dies or resigns, the Prime Minister fills up the vacancy. The Cabinet never co-opts a new member. It must accept the Prime Minister's choice. But if the Prime Minister himself retires, then all the cabinet offices are held to be vacant and the new Prime Minister has a free hand in reconstructing the government, though the government has not met defeat and the same party is still holding office.

The Prime Minister also has to appoint to many non-political offices. Most of the royal patronage is in his hands. He nominates, of course always 'with submission' to the King, the highest judges, the bishops and other dignitaries of the Church, the Viceroy of India and colonial governors. Peerages, titles, and honours are also in his gift, even some academic positions such as the Regius professorships at the older universities. How and where he seeks advice is his own business. The personality of the Prime Minister therefore is felt in every branch of government and every corner of the kingdom.

It is important to note that in recent times the prime ministership has not been the monopoly of any one class. In this century our Prime Ministers have come from various

social strata. Of the nine men who have held office since 1902, two may be considered to come from the aristocracy, five from the middle class, and two from 'the people.' The aristocrats are Balfour and Churchill, one the nephew of a Marquis, the other the grandson of a Duke. Lloyd George and Ramsay Macdonald rose from very humble origins. Their places of education are worthy of note. Balfour—Eton; Campbell-Bannerman—Glasgow High School; Asquith—City of London School; Lloyd George—Llanystymdwy Church School; Bonar Law—Glasgow High School; Baldwin—Harrow; Macdonald—Drainie Village School; Chamberlain—Rugby; Churchill—Harrow. Their professions also have been varied. Churchill started as a soldier, Macdonald as a journalist and writer, Lloyd George as a solicitor, and Asquith a barrister, Bonar Law, Baldwin, and Chamberlain were business men, Balfour and Campbell-Bannerman had private means.

Four have been Englishmen, three Scotsmen, one Canadian-Scot, and one Welsh. Only three have been members of the Church of England.

The Cabinet

The Cabinet over which the Prime Minister presides was, until recently, a quite informal body unknown to the law of the constitution. Since 1937, however, it has been recognised by a statute which provides for equal pay for all members except the Prime Minister and Lord Chancellor, who receive twice as much as their colleagues. By this statute the names of ministers called to cabinet rank must be published in the London Gazette. The Cabinet, however, is a perfectly flexible institution. There is no fixed number of Cabinet Ministers. A normal Cabinet before the war consisted of over twenty members, but in the so-called crisis of 1931 it was cut down to ten in order to

work more quickly. During this war we have had a War Cabinet of six or seven members. The Cabinet, however, is not a body possessing powers in itself. But it wields the sum total of the powers of all the ministers. Thus in one day it may be decided that the Foreign Secretary shall send a note to a foreign power, the Minister of Health shall offer a housing subsidy to local authorities, the Minister of Labour shall issue certain instructions to all labour exchanges, the Admiralty shall order a new aircraft-carrier, the Home Secretary shall order certain changes in the prison system. The legal power to do all these things rests in the minister concerned. It is his *order:* it is the Cabinet's *decision.*

Only some questions come before the Cabinet, namely, very important matters, or contentious matters about which different departments cannot agree. The Cabinet then decides. If any minister thinks that the policy decided upon is utterly wrong, then he should resign. Otherwise he must loyally accept the decision, do his best to carry it out and, if necessary, defend it in public. Inside each government office decisions are being taken daily by individual ministers or being discussed with the Treasury if the policy in question requires the spending of public money.

The Civil Service

Each minister has at his command a large staff of professional administrators. These we call Civil Servants, or if we happen to dislike what they are doing at the moment, bureaucrats. The Civil Service even in normal times consists of several hundred thousands of men and women, including customs officers, postal officials, and so on. But the specialised, policy-controlling officials in the offices in Whitehall, the men whom the minister himself may send for to give him information or receive instructions, are a small body. Some, like medical, legal, or engineering

experts, are professional men who must have technical qualifications. The remainder are recruited in their early twenties by an intensely competitive examination from graduates of universities. This method of recruiting civil servants was one of the chief political inventions of the nineteenth century. It was put into general use by Gladstone in 1870. It has two great merits. It prevents ministers giving jobs by personal or political favour: it ensures a high degree of intellectual ability, for many of the ablest students from the universities compete annually and only about fifty are chosen.

Most of the successful candidates come from Oxford and Cambridge. It is sometimes thought that this is because the subjects of examination are those specially favoured at Oxford and Cambridge, classics and mathematics, or that the examiners are biassed in their favour. This is untrue. There is a wide selection of subjects, including the more modern studies, and the papers are numbered so that the examiners do not know whose paper they are marking. The explanation is that Oxford and Cambridge, with their large number of scholarships open to competition, attract the ablest schoolboys from all over the country Once appointed, the civil servant becomes an expert in the work of his department. It is his business to serve the minister whatever his political views may be. In the long run the policy he executes is that which parliament demands. But a weak, ignorant or lazy minister may be very much under the influence of his permanent staff. A strong, active and able minister will bend them to his will. The political influence of civil servants is usually exaggerated by the public. In peace-time people complain that these men in Whitehall govern us altogether; in war-time the complaint is that they are incapable of action.

Local Government

Beyond the central government in Whitehall lies a

complex structure of local authorities, whose work may play more part in the life of the ordinary citizen than the government in London. There are two forms of local authority. The shires which are now governed by County Councils and subdivided into urban and rural districts and parishes are very ancient units going back to the dim epoch of the Anglo-Saxons. The cities or towns, ' County Boroughs ', may be ancient like London or York which go back to Roman times, or new towns built up in the last thirty years. In county or borough a popularly elected council levies a rate on the rentable value of property. It provides roads and streets, police, education, health and other services. But it is very far from being an independent body, for the revenue from local taxes is not enough even for the wealthiest borough. The central government makes grants-in-aid to local authorities. These take various forms, but recently the principle has been adopted of paying grants to local authorities according to their need, the wealth or poverty of the district, the percentage of unemployed, the number of school-children. Wherever the central government gives a subsidy it has the right of inspection and the power to control.

The Ministry of Health is the office in charge of local government, but the Ministries of Labour and Agriculture, the Home Office, and the Board of Education are also concerned. The texture of English social services and local government is made up by a complex interweaving of threads between the Town and County Halls and the Ministries in Whitehall. Parliament and Cabinet lay down the general principles. A prosperous and enlightened borough will provide better roads, schools, health, and welfare services than a poor or backward borough, but the major changes and policies are decided at the centre. More and more Englishmen's lives are governed by what parliament and the ministers entrusted with power by parliament decide.

Parliament

Parliament therefore is the key to British policy in great things or in small. It has three main duties. Each year it is called on to make provision for the service of His Majesty's Government. Each government department lays before the House of Commons a more or less detailed estimate for the expenditure of that department during the coming financial year. These estimates may be rejected or reduced but they cannot be increased. Only the Crown can ask for supply, and members of parliament are thereby checked from advocating expenditure on their own initiative. After the estimates have been accepted parliament must then approve of the necessary taxes or loans to cover the estimates and also the "consolidated fund charges," i.e., the interest on the national debt, and other items such as the salaries of the judges which are not voted annually. This financial business is begun early in the year and usually completed by the end of July.

The second duty of parliament is to make laws. No year passes in which it is not necessary to amend old law or make new law. Also, since in normal times the legal power to raise and discipline a standing army has to be voted each year, there is one act which parliament *must* pass.

Thirdly, parliament, in this case actually the House of Commons, designates the government. A party or a coalition of parties is in the majority of the Commons. The leader of this party is the man whom the King will summon to form a ministry. He will hold office as long as he retains the confidence of the House. There is no settled rule as to what constitutes a vote of no confidence. A government defeat in the House on a small matter will not bring down the ministry, but the refusal to vote supply or the rejection of a major legislative project introduced by the government, will be taken as an intimation by the House that the government must go. Sometimes a direct vote of censure is moved

stating in so many words that His Majesty's ministers no longer enjoy the confidence of the House. If defeated the ministry must either resign, and the King will send for the leader of the opposition, or else the Prime Minister will advise the King to dissolve parliament and let the electors decide the issue.

The House of Lords

A parliament is summoned by royal writs issued from the Chancery. These writs are of two kinds. Some are sent to the mayors of boroughs and sheriffs of counties, commanding them to hold elections for the House of Commons. Others are sent to individuals, commanding them to attend at Westminster for a parliament on a certain day. Those who receive these personal writs are the members of the House of Lords. This distinction between personal writs and general writs to the sheriffs is very old ; it is found in Magna Carta. The Lords, or Peers of Parliament, consist of four main classes. First are the hereditary peers whose ancestors have been summoned to parliament and made lords. These form the majority of the House. Then there are those who have been made peers in their own lifetime and who form a more numerous and important element in the House than is usually realised. Their descendants will be hereditary peers. Then there are the archbishops and bishops of the Church, that is the twenty-six most senior of them. Finally there are certain high judges—the Lords of Appeal in Ordinary. They and the bishops are the only life members in the assembly.

Two hundred years ago the House of Lords was as important as the Commons, and most of the King's chief ministers were peers. By a slow process their power declined until in 1911 the Parliament Act was passed to limit their authority. This act removed from them the power to reject any money bill and left it to the Speaker of the Commons to define a money bill. It also provided that if the Commons

passed a bill three times in the space of not less than two years it would become law whether the Lords assented to it or not. This leaves the Lords with power to debate, to delay and obstruct, but not to put an insurmountable obstacle to the Commons' will. This Act has scarcely been tested, for in the last twenty-five years there has in fact been little friction between the two houses.

The House of Commons

In the Commons, then, is the focus and centre of all British government. The Prime Minister is there and most of his fellow ministers. On the opposition benches can be seen the Prime Minister presumptive and many of those who would form his cabinet. A political enthusiast from the Strangers' Gallery can see the public men whom he loves and hates and hear them doing their best and worst. In the Distinguished Strangers' Gallery foreign ambassadors may watch and report to their governments on the mood and feeling of the country, just as four hundred years ago the Venetian ambassador filled his despatches to the Council of that great republic with reports of what he heard was brewing in the Commons House. Hot and bitter as the debates may sometimes be, they are restrained by custom and good feeling and above all by respect for the authority of the Speaker, who arbitrates between Government and Opposition and calls members to order for any breach of the rules and the polite usages of the House. The Speaker's office is of great antiquity, as old as parliament itself. He is chosen as a man whose character all members will respect; he is re-elected irrespective of party feeling and he is expected to maintain complete impartiality. As the Prime Minister is the Leader of the House so is the Speaker its Judge.

The House of Commons is not merely a debating assembly. It has, as we have seen, duties to carry out in the governing of the country. Since in modern times there is always

great pressure of business, the standing orders of the House vest much power in the Government, and are devised to prevent frivolous interruption and waste of time. In an ordinary session business promoted by the Government has precedence of all other business on about seven days out of eight. If the Government desires to close a debate, the closure may be moved and passed by a majority vote of members. But it is for the Speaker to decide whether to accept this motion for the closure or not, for he is charged to see that the rights of the minority in the House are not infringed. The Government therefore makes the time-table of the House. It might seem that in this way it could avoid awkward questions and stifle criticism. But in fact it cannot do this, although the rules make it difficult for individual members to raise the subjects they would like to raise at the time they want to. But the Government cannot evade criticism. When the estimates for any department are voted, all the work of that department comes under review. Why have we not more destroyers, or aircraft? Why are rates of pay in the army unfair? Is the Minister of Health doing all that can be done to stamp out diphtheria? Is the President of the Board of Education really up to date in his ideas about the nutrition of school-children? Should not the Minister of Agriculture encourage the growth of different crops? Has the Secretary for Scotland nothing better to propose about the slums of Glasgow?

But the estimates are presented only once a year. When that opportunity is passed the members fall back on that remarkable institution of the House of Commons, Question Time. At the beginning of each sitting, members are allowed to put questions to ministers of the Crown. They must give notice of the questions beforehand and the questions must conform to certain rules enforced by the Speaker. Ministers will be in their place to answer them or will

arrange for a colleague to do so. In this way the Government can be raked fore and aft with a fire of implied criticism. It is sometimes said that questions to ministers have become an abuse because of the time that the departments have to give to preparing answers. But as long as the custom continues, British subjects will not lack a most effective means of ventilating their grievances.

If the Opposition wants to challenge the Government on some matter that is not coming up in the ordinary business routine, it asks for a day to debate the question and tables a hostile motion. The Government must allow the debate or be accused of cowardice.

Committees

The House of Commons, like all governmental deliberative bodies, makes use of committees. There is the Committee of the whole House which is not a committee in the real sense, but merely a slightly less formal meeting of the House to discuss finance or the details of a Bill. But to save the time of the House, most Bills are sent to standing committees of fifty or sixty members who act as a kind of sample of the House. There are also smaller Select Committees. These are appointed to investigate the procedure of the House and suggest improvements. They may be appointed to investigate any special problem of government or to clear up some alleged scandal. They may hear outside evidence and summon witnesses. Small committees are also used for what are called Private Bills. A better description of such bills would be 'particular'; they are bills of local or special import. If a borough wants to extend its boundaries or acquire new powers, if legal authority is required for a new railway line or electricity undertaking, a 'private' bill is promoted and a small committee of members will hear and decide the case for and against. The House as a whole rarely discusses such matters.

One form of committee usual in other parliaments is not

found in the House of Commons, namely committees relative to departments of government, such as War, Foreign Affairs, Finance, Education, Trade, etc. This may be a serious deficiency in our machinery of government and shortcomings during the period of rearmament might perhaps have been remedied if small, expert, and vigilant committees had been able to investigate the problem. The orthodox doctrine, however, is that such committees are baneful and weaken ministers' responsibility, although Mr. Lloyd George has given his formidable testimony on the other side. During this war a Select Committee on Public Expenditure has a roving commission to investigate activities of government and is said to have done good work.

Composition of the House

A modern House of Commons is composed of men of all classes and varied professions. There are always some heirs to peerages and at the same time men who have been manual workers, especially miners. There are men of great wealth and men who have known the extremes of poverty. More than a third of every House are university graduates; retired officers of the army and navy are there in some numbers; and barristers form an important element of any House, their legal knowledge and skill in pleading rendering them particularly useful members. Members are paid a salary of £600 a year. This is supposed to be enough to maintain a member but too little to make politics a paying profession. Financial difficulties indeed deter many men from standing for parliament, especially young men with families. Women have been eligible for membership since 1918. In January 1943, there were eleven women members. One woman has been a cabinet minister and more have been under-ministers. As the electorate has widened and made its influence felt, so the composition and social manners of the House have changed also, as was

shown some time ago when the Clydeside Socialist members induced the Kitchen Committee to supply the democratic northern meal, high tea. It was once supposed to be, though never quite accurately, an exclusive aristocratic club. It is so no longer.

The Electors

What then is the electorate which brings the House of Commons into existence? Who have the right to vote and what methods of voting are used? The broad answer is simple. The electors are the entire adult population of the country. It is a long journey which has led parliament to this goal. Until the famous Reform Bill of 1832, the parliamentary franchise was on a traditional basis. Each borough had its own law; some had a narrow franchise and some a broad franchise. In the counties the right to vote was laid down by a statute of King Henry VI in 1430; it was limited to those who held freehold land to the annual value of forty shillings. This law lasted 402 years. It was passed one year after the appearance of Joan of Arc, 23 years before the Turks captured Constantinople, 62 years before Columbus discovered America, 87 years before Luther started the Reformation, 346 years before the Declaration of Independence, and 359 years before the outbreak of the French Revolution. The Emperor Napoleon had been in his grave eight years before it was altered. Such is the continuity of English institutions.

During this long period parliament had successfully asserted its supremacy over the Church, over the Crown, over custom and common law, failing only in one thing, to maintain its supremacy over the colonies of North America. In 1832 the ice broke and parliament remodelled itself to meet the demands of the active and politically minded part of the people, who insisted that the representative system should no longer be fossilised but made real and rational. In the course of the next century there

followed progressive extensions of the right to vote which made our government a democracy. Different dates may be taken for the coming of democracy; the year 1867, when the working men of the towns were brought in; the year 1884, when the labouring classes in the countryside, farm-workers, and miners, were given the vote; the year 1918, when all adult males and women over thirty were enfranchised; the year 1928 when all women over twenty-one were admitted. Another possible date is the year 1911 when, by the Parliament Act, the House of Lords lost its power of vetoing absolutely the legislation of the Commons.

The franchise is universal; it is also very nearly equal. With two exceptions the rule of one man one vote prevails. The first exception is that an elector may vote twice, but no more, at one general election, if he is registered on different qualifications in two constituencies; for example, he may vote for his residence in a suburb and for his place of business in the city. The other exception is quaint and unusual in modern representative government. In 1603 King James I, the only very learned monarch who ever sat on the throne of England, sent writs to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge instructing them to return two members each to the House of Commons. They have done so ever since, and in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the Scottish universities and the newer universities of England, of Wales and of Northern Ireland have been added. This is the only sign of anything like functional or corporative representation in the House of Commons. Great corporate bodies may have much power, and sinister influence is often imputed by their enemies to the City of London, the Federation of British Industries, the Liquor Trade, the Trades Union Congress, Catholic or Jewish organisations, but that influence to be effective must be exercised on the members of parliament or on those who elect them. The university members are elected by all

graduates who are British subjects and the voting is by post. Recently the university electors have shown a tendency to choose independent members instead of party men. As only twelve out of the 615 members of the House are elected by the universities the matter is of no great importance.

Conduct of Elections

All citizens have their names placed on the register of electors provided they have a permanent address and fill up the forms sent to the head of the household in each house. The vote is by ballot, that is, it is secret. The voter goes to the polling booth, usually a school, gives his name to the clerk, receives a paper which he takes to a curtained recess, and fills it up by placing a cross against the name of his candidate. The poll closes at eight or nine o'clock the same evening, and all the ballot boxes are taken to a central place, the shire or town hall. Counting may begin that night or may be delayed till next morning. The ballot boxes are opened and checked and the papers counted in one mass. It is not possible to tell how the different wards or polling districts in the constituency have voted. The returning officer is the Sheriff in all Scottish seats, the High Sheriff in English Counties, and the Mayor in English Boroughs. He employs the polling clerks and enumerators and decides all disputed questions. If any false practice is suspected in the conduct of the election a petition is presented and an enquiry is held by two Judges of the High Court. Candidates are limited in the amount of money they can spend in conducting the election according to the number of electors. If a candidate exceeds this allowance, or if he or his assistants offer any bribes or inducements, then he may be unseated and another election held.

Candidates

Any elector may offer himself as a candidate except Peers of the Realm who sit in the House of Lords, clergy

of the established church, and Roman Catholic priests, bankrupts or lunatics. But no one may sit in the House if he is being paid by the state, so civil servants, members of the armed forces, and persons contracting to supply the government are excluded. The candidate need not be a resident of the district. This is very important, for it enables men of merit to find a seat in any part of the kingdom. Sometimes a prominent politician is driven from pillar to post like the late Foreign Secretary, Mr. Arthur Henderson, who moved from County Durham to Widnes, from Widnes to Burnley, from Burnley to Derbyshire. Sometimes a man will sit for his native place, like Mr. Lloyd George, who has represented Carnarvon Boroughs for fifty-two years without a break. The cost of holding the election is borne by the state, but to prevent frivolous candidatures a deposit of £150 has to be made on nomination. This will be refunded unless the candidate receives less than one-eighth of the votes cast.

The Electoral System

With the exception of a few double-member boroughs the constituencies each return one member. At the last redistribution of seats in 1918, the constituencies were approximately equal, but population changes since then have produced inequalities. There is no provision in our electoral law to secure that the candidate declared elected shall be supported by the majority of the voters. If there are only two candidates the winner must have a majority, but if, as often happens, there are three or more candidates, the seat goes to the candidate with the larger number of votes even though they may be less than half. Devices like the second ballot or the alternative vote could easily be adopted to rectify this, but English opinion is on the whole satisfied with the system. It is what has always been. Ever

since sheriffs had to count heads in order to see who had been elected to parliament, the simple plurality rule has prevailed; a majority in the strict sense of more than half the votes has never been required.

While anyone who can raise £150 and secure eight electors to nominate him can become a candidate, the choice of candidates and the organisation of elections are in fact the work of political parties. The local association of the party in the constituency usually appoints its executive committee to find a candidate and then the association as a whole will approve of the choice or perhaps decide between more than one presented. If the local leaders can find no candidate of their own, then the central executive of the party in London is consulted. It will have a list of possible candidates and will suggest several names, perhaps a young journalist or barrister anxious to go into politics, perhaps an experienced leader who is for the moment without a seat. He will come down and be adopted even if he has never seen the constituency before. The American term 'carpet-bagger' is used to denote such candidates, but it is not a term of abuse, except in so far as the other side may use it to point the contrast with their own local candidate, "Mr. Blank whom you all know, a Blankshire man for a Blankshire seat." Many of our greatest statesmen have been carpet-baggers, Mr. Churchill, for instance, who has sped from Oldham to Manchester, to Dundee, to Essex. The central executive of the party cannot compel the local party to accept a candidate whom it sends. But if the local association wants financial help from the centre, as it often does, then the central body has the whip hand. Moreover, if the member elected is unorthodox or disloyal, then he may be expelled from the party by "refusing him the whip." This means that he will no longer receive the summons and instructions sent out to members by the chief whip or party manager. Unless he can retain the confidence of his local

supporters and he or they can produce enough funds to fight a contest, he will not be renominated at the next election.

The Party System

The rules and conventions of the English party system are all devised for two parties only. In the House of Commons, which is rectangular in shape, a member is expected to sit on the Speaker's right with the Government, or with the Opposition on the Speaker's left. Party politics go back to the reign of Charles II (1660–1685) when the Whig and Tory parties arose. Of these the Whigs were the enemies and the Tories the supporters of royal authority. By the nineteenth century these two parties had become the Liberals and the Conservatives, and in spite of many changes and contradictions something of the old differences between them survived. The Liberals were the party of "progress, reform, improvement, liberty." The Tories, now Conservatives, were the party of authority, tradition, conservatism. The Conservatives were the supporters of, and were supported by, the Established Church. The Liberals were aided by the Nonconformists. The Conservatives were strong in Southern England and in rural and residential areas, the Liberals in Scotland, Wales, and Northern England, and in mining and industrial areas.

In 1906 the Labour party began to be prominent and in 1919 it became the most effective opposition to the Conservatives. Thus, we had a three-party system. This was awkward for a nation accustomed to think in the plain terms of yea and nay with only two parties. One way of facing the situation was to pretend that it did not exist, to say that there was only one issue and that people must form up into two parties to decide that issue. This was the Labour view; either you were for or against the workers, for or against the capitalist system. But the threefold division was real. A Conservative might think that the chief issue was the

danger of socialism, but none the less he could not get on with the Liberals, whom he thought priggish, doctrinaire, and unpractical. The Liberal thought the Conservatives to be stupid and arrogant but, much as he longed to overthrow them, he could not ally with the Labour party for he did not believe in socialism and he could not suppose 'the workers' to be always right. He believed that nobody could be always right except himself in knowing it to be impossible so to be. So with the Liberals ground between the upper and nether millstones of conservatism and socialism, our politics were conducted on a three-party basis. Because of our electoral system this produces strange results.

Under the two-party system, if a party gains a decisive victory at an election the majority it has in the House of Commons will probably be greater in proportion than its actual majority among the electors. This was in some ways an advantage, for it gave the Government a better working majority in the House. But under the three-party system it has happened that a party with a minority in the electoral vote may get a large majority in the House of Commons. This happened in the Conservative victories of 1922 and 1924. Now this is not what representative parliamentary democracy is supposed to mean. But it has a rough justification in common sense. That party which has the largest amount of support, even if it is not in an actual majority, is entitled to govern the country. No other party has as good a title. If the system benefits one party to-day, another party may benefit from it to-morrow, or if the opposition parties object, then let them unite and so form a majority of the electors. It is more important that some party should have a disciplined coherent majority in the House than that abstract electoral justice should be done.

The majority of British citizens undoubtedly accept this rough and ready answer. It is only a minority who declare that the matter must be dealt with by a reform of the

electoral system which would set up proportional representation. Proportional representation would have the effect of ensuring that a party would not secure a majority of the House unless and until it had a majority in the electorate. Each party would be represented more or less according to the number of voters it attracted. This would have two advantages; it would make the practice of our elections square with the theory, and even in Anglo-Saxon countries there is some value in harmonising theory and practice: it would mean that parliament was dominated by the medium or moderate view in politics and not by one of two extreme views. On the other hand it can be argued that to give the middle party always a balancing power is just as much a departure from true representation as to favour the extreme parties.

How the country would have fared for the last twenty years under proportional representation no one can tell. Analogies from other countries are deceptive. Ireland, which has proportional representation, has changed governments only once, Belgium many times. France, which had not proportional representation, changed government many times and Canada seldom. We do know what did happen in this country. In the twenty years between the wars we have had for seventeen years a large conservative majority in the House of Commons, either a pure party majority as in 1922 and 1924, or a coalition basically conservative as in 1918, 1931, and 1935 For three years, 1924 and 1929-31, there was a Labour Government without a clear party majority. On the whole we have enjoyed the advantages, such as they are, of 'strong' governments, meaning by strong, governments that have not had to fear from day to day that a mercurial legislature would turn them out.

But our electoral system, combined with the tendency to electoral landslides which universal suffrage and especially women's suffrage seems to bring, has had the effect of

making our governments, safe between elections because of rigid party discipline, feel extremely unsafe at elections. The stakes at an election are very high. If you can poll, not necessarily half the votes in the country but substantially more than either of the other two parties, then you may capture two-thirds of the House. The whole machine of government is in your hands. You can give the country the government which you think is right for a full five years. There is no doubt whatever what the doctrine of the British Constitution is as to the duty of members. This was laid down by Burke when he said that a member owes his electors not his obedience but his judgment. He is there to do what he thinks is right. There is no system of recalling him or making him a delegate. But in practice politicians have to ask themselves what the electors are going to say at the end of the five years. If by doing what is right you make yourselves unpopular, you hand over the government to your enemies who are in your opinion wrong-headed, bad-blooded, and incompetent. Is it not better to temporise, to do rather less than you think is right in order to stave off a worse evil? There are many signs that such feelings did affect our rulers in the past twenty years. In foreign policy they had to speak in terms of the League of Nations and collective security, without really believing in these things or indeed, in the case of many of them, knowing what they meant. For if they lost votes by doing what they thought right on foreign policy, then all the advantages they enjoyed under the electoral system would go to the other side, that is to say, to the socialists and this, so it was said, meant national ruin. It may be asked whether this does not show a radical defect in the system of government and whether we shall not have the same difficulties after the war. Whatever course party politics may take after the war it is probably safe to say that there will be much less fear of 'national ruin'. We have learned

so much about national ruin in so many forms that it will not be the same sort of bogey. It would probably be an illusion to suppose that Englishmen will love each other more after the war, but having looked Nazi Germany in the face across the Straits of Dover, they may fear each other less. Governments may be more willing to accept the ideas of the great classic age of our parliamentary government, the days of Gladstone and Disraeli, to do what they think is right and even ride for a fall. Defeat in the sense of a mere electoral defeat will perhaps seem less terrible to men who lived through the summer of 1940. Proletarian Russia may seem less terrible to those who have known her as an ally and capitalist America less odious to those who have used her armaments, been sustained by her food, and fought with her soldiers.

One thing at least may be said about living under the rule of universal suffrage. It used to be feared that under extreme democracy the masses would ask for nothing but bread and circuses and would shrink from sacrifices. Yet in the financial crisis of 1931 it was the Conservatives who proposed to lower wages, raise taxes, and reduce doles and were swept into power in triumph, while it was the Socialists, who promised to preserve all these good things, that were left complaining of mass hysteria and popular fallacies. And during this war it is the ministers who have asked for most sacrifice that have been the most popular. Blood, toil, sweat, and tears is not the slogan that would formerly have been considered a good cry for a demagogue, but politicians vie with each other now in offering these commodities. Indeed, historians in the distant future may be hard put to it to decide whether our system of government in this epoch is more to be blamed for the fact that this war with a recently defeated and disarmed enemy ever began, or praised for the qualities that have enabled us thus far to endure it.

OXFORD PAMPHLETS ON HOME AFFAIRS
No. H.1

HOW BRITAIN IS GOVERNED

BY
R. B. McCALLUM

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
1943

THIS pamphlet describes the institutions and methods by which Great Britain is governed. It shows the development of royal and parliamentary government and how a constitutional system can be based on monarchy and at the same time controlled by universal suffrage. The relations between the United Kingdom and the other parts of the Commonwealth are not discussed here, nor is there space to describe what tasks our government performs. The pamphlet explains the relations between Crown, Ministers, Parliament and people, examines the variations that exist between the different parts of the Kingdom and how the party system works in effecting the will of the electors.

Mr. R. B. McCallum is a native of industrial Clydeside, a graduate of Oxford and of Princeton University, U.S.A. He has been for seventeen years a Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford, and has been engaged in the teaching of history and political science. He is the author of a life of Asquith, Prime Minister 1908-16.

First published March 1943
First published in India November 1943

Printed at the Diocesan Press, Madras, India and published by
THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, *Amen House, E.C.4.*
LONDON EDINBURGH GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO
MELBOURNE CAPETOWN BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS
HUMPHREY MILFORD *Publisher to the University*

HOW BRITAIN IS GOVERNED

Monarchy

THE Government of Great Britain is in the form of a monarchy. It has always been so. Only for eleven years of irregular government under Cromwell and his supporters has any other form been known. To be governed by a hereditary ruler has been the most common experience of the greater part of the human race throughout recorded history. It must therefore be supposed to be the most natural form of government. Twelve of the states of Europe at the present day are monarchies. Of the United Nations, seven are monarchies or, if we count the self-governing Dominions, eleven. Of the Axis powers five have a monarchical form of government.

No visitor to Britain can fail to observe the forms and style of monarchy wherever he goes. Letters are transmitted by the Royal Mail; any disorder, from a public-house scuffle to a great riot, is a breach of the King's peace; criminals are arrested in the King's name, sentenced by his authority, and pardoned by his grace. If an enemy state makes war on us his forces encounter the ships of the Royal Navy, the guns of the Royal Artillery, the tanks of the Royal Armoured Corps, and the aircraft of the Royal Air Force. There is another thing to notice about our monarchy. It is very old. No other royal house in Europe can surpass it in the antiquity and continuity of its descent. Our present King is descended from the early Saxon Kings of Wessex and from the first Kings to rule over all Scotland. Alfred the Great and the King Duncan of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* are his undoubted ancestors. The great royal houses of Europe, the Bourbons, the Hapsburgs, the Hohenzollerns, the Romanoffs have risen and fallen, our royal house rose before them and has continued after them. What is the reason for this astonishing power of survival?

Partly it may be due to the fact that Britain is an island, like Japan, and free from many forms of external pressure,

still more is it due to certain qualities in our kings, and in our people. The Kings of England have never exercised an absolute power nor their subjects known a complete subjection. As far back as the fourteenth century the French chronicler Froissart wrote, with exaggeration, that "the King of England must needs obey his people and do all their will." A hundred years later an English judge, Fortescue, said that while other countries like France were to be described as a Royal Dominion, England was something different and better, a Dominion Royal and Political. By this he meant that there was in England a habit of consultation and a means of restraint in government. This consultation and restraint, as we know, was and is exercised by Parliament. Parliaments were not an exclusively English invention. In the middle ages most states in Europe had them in some form or another. In some countries, such as Sweden, they have a tradition almost as continuous; but because England was greater, richer, and more powerful, it is the English Parliament that has become the chief copy and example.

Constitutional Government

So far as the mere forms of law go, the King in this country summons and dissolves parliaments, appoints and dismisses ministers, makes treaties and declares war and peace. Yet we know that in fact the King does not rule the country. The laws are made and the taxes voted by Parliament. The executive acts of government, the making and conducting of a war and the concluding of a treaty of peace, are performed by the Prime Minister and the Cabinet. The cabinet ministers are men acceptable to the people, not chosen directly like the American President or Governors of States, but approved by the majority of the people's representatives in the House of Commons, who are assumed, and we shall later on discuss how far the assumption is true,

to speak the people's will. The people of England therefore claim that they are free to govern themselves and at the same time to enjoy all that is valuable in the splendour and symbolism of monarchy. They do not feel themselves to be less free because they have a king, but most of them would feel that their life as a community would lose in colour and stability if they had a king no longer.

For the monarchy in this country does give stability to the government. It means that one of the great questions, what is to be the form of government, is settled. Whatever else we may dispute about we need not fight about that. But because we live under a constitutional monarchy there are many things we can dispute about freely and safely. In the last hundred years or so this country has changed from being an aristocracy to a democracy. It might be thought that if this is so we need not consider the past in explaining how Britain is governed. But some of the essential facts of our constitution were settled long ago, in 1688. This was the year of the English Revolution, which we call the 'glorious' revolution, glorious not because it was long and bloody like the American, French, and Russian Revolutions, but because it was swift and bloodless. The people of England expelled King James II because he ruled in defiance of the laws, and they took, as King and Queen, William, Prince of Orange, and Mary his wife, the daughter of James. Two great acts of parliament known as the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement, laid down the fundamental bases of our rights. The King could not suspend and alter laws which parliament had made; he could not raise taxes without parliament's consent nor have a standing army in time of peace unless parliament approved. He could not imprison subjects without trial nor dismiss judges once they had been appointed. It is true that the King could still choose his own ministers, that the House of Lords was left almost equal powers with the Commons and

that the House of Commons was elected by a small part of the whole populace and therefore might not represent them. If democracy means equality, we were worlds away from reaching it. But if it means freedom of the individual, then many essential points had been established by the time King William died in 1702.

After the last war it was the fashion to take these mere civil and individual liberties for granted, as something won beyond dispute; it remained only to press on to social and economic liberties. We know now that this confidence was false. In this war we are fighting for them again. President Roosevelt's catalogue of freedoms includes new goals for humanity made possible by the great wealth of modern society. But it includes also the old freedoms, which we secured under William III and the Americans under Washington.

Divisions of the Country. Wales

In considering the government of Great Britain we must consider exactly what is governed. It is not merely England, although England has 38 million out of the 47 million inhabitants of this country or the 70 millions of white population of the whole British Commonwealth. From the point of view of law and administration the United Kingdom is divided into three parts: (1) England and Wales; (2) Scotland; (3) Northern Ireland. All three are under the sovereignty of Parliament or, to put it more correctly, the King-in-Parliament, but there are important variations in their law and government.

Wales is not quite in the same system as England. The Anglican church there has been disestablished, there is a special department of education for Wales, and a Welsh committee in the House of Commons for all Welsh Bills. In spite of these comparatively small variations in government the Welsh remain very much a nation with their own

language taught in the schools and used in the home. Wales was conquered by Edward I (1272–1307) and brought completely into the English governmental system by Henry VIII (1509–1547). In the eighteenth century it was swept by the great Methodist revival of Wesley and Whitefield and the majority of the people left the Anglican communion and founded their own chapels. There they learned to exercise their wonderful gift of singing and preaching, and nurtured a keen democratic community life, which in some ways has more in common with the Dominions and the United States than with Southern England. The Welsh are acutely conscious of their nationality and a stranger to this country who addresses them as English will not be well-received.

Scotland

Scotland has many variations from England and, like the Welsh, the Scots are a distinct nation. Overseas, an impression is common that Scotland, like Ireland and Wales, was a conquest of England. This is not so. It is truer to say that Scotland inherited England. In the year 1603 the King of Scotland, James VI, became heir to the English crown on the death of Queen Elizabeth. One of his predecessors on the throne of Scotland had married with the English House of Tudor and so he succeeded (as James I) when the Tudor line died out. For a century Scotland and England remained separate governments under one king. In 1707, by an act of wise and far-sighted statesmanship, the English government admitted Scotland to a full union under terms sufficiently generous to be accepted by that proud people. Since then there has been one parliament and one government for the two nations. But the Scots preserved what they most valued, their presbyterian church and their own system of law. In England the King is the governor of the Church; "in all causes

ecclesiastical as well as temporal supreme." In Scotland there is indeed an established church, but its lofty theology concedes no more to the King than the place of "First Civil Magistrate." In England the King appoints the bishops, in Scotland he cannot even nominate the minister of the parish which contains Balmoral Castle. Scottish Law differs in many important respects from English law. It has been much more influenced by Roman Law, its provisions dealing with land, inheritance, and marriage being different from English law. Court practice is also different. More use is made of professional stipendiary magistrates (sheriffs). A Scottish jury need not be unanimous and can bring in a third verdict 'not proven' if the logic of facts requires it. Such intellectual compulsions are not supposed to trouble English juries. Scotland is ruled through a cabinet minister, the Secretary of State for Scotland, at the head of a Scottish Office, part of which is in Westminster and part in Edinburgh. He answers questions on Scotland in the House, presents the Scottish estimates of expenditure and sponsors Scottish legislation before a Scottish committee.

Northern Ireland

Northern Ireland is the most clearly separate of the divisions of the United Kingdom. It comprises six of the nine counties of the old Irish Province of Ulster. The majority of its inhabitants are protestants of Anglo-Scottish descent. In 1914 they were prepared to resort to arms rather than live under an Irish Nationalist government in Dublin. After the war their right of self-determination was recognised and they were excluded from the Irish Free State when it received dominion status. Northern Ireland is in a position similar to a Canadian province. It returns members to the national parliament at Westminster and contributes to defence and common purposes. But it has its own parlia-

ment and government. There is a Governor, a Prime Minister and Cabinet, and a legislature of two houses. It has its own High Court which administers English Common Law in so far as legislation has not altered it for Irish purposes. From the High Court at Belfast, as from the Court of Session at Edinburgh, appeals can be taken to the House of Lords at Westminster.

It is in Northern Ireland that the United Kingdom has its only land frontier. It is a frontier which presents most of the problems and difficulties of the frontiers of Central Europe about which the British and Americans are apt to complain as causes of needless friction. The frontier of Ulster has almost none of the qualities of a good frontier. It is not a national frontier for in the two counties of Fermanagh and Tyrone on the Ulster side there are rather more Irish Nationalists than Protestant Ulstermen. It is not a good geographical frontier for it comes south of the water-barrier of Lough Erne, and it approaches but does not reach the sea at Donegal Bay. It merely follows old county boundaries which had no relation to economics, strategy, or population. But as with many other artificial frontiers, use and wont may make it work. Northern Ireland is the only part of the kingdom where there is any serious attempt at devolution of the function of government to provincial legislatures. The experiment in many ways has worked well, but it is of less value for comparison because one party, the Unionist, Protestant, or Orange party, is permanently in power while the Catholic, Nationalist, or Irish party is hostile to the whole conception of an Ulster state.

The Sovereign Parliament

But over every part of the United Kingdom the Parliament of Westminster is sovereign and any statute "enacted by the King's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice

and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and the Commons" prevails over any other enactment whether by a subordinate legislature or an ordinance by the Crown alone. It prevails also over any preceding act of parliament, as is shown by the fact that the present parliament, elected in 1935 and due by the Act of 1911 to be dissolved in 1940, has been continued by its own authority. There is no way by which the people can recall or dissolve a Parliament. Only the King has that power. He exercises it on the advice of the Prime Minister. This may be a Prime Minister securely in office who may decide on a good moment at which to dissolve, or a new Prime Minister who wants to give the electors a chance of supporting him with a large majority. It might happen that after more than one election no party could form a government with a secure majority. Then the King, rather than grant a dissolution to some political leader, might refuse to dissolve and might tell the leading statesmen of the various parties that they must find some way of agreeing to carry on the government.

The King

As we have seen, the most fundamental executive powers are vested in the Crown and exercised by ministers. Additional powers are given by statute to individual ministers, such as the emergency powers of detaining persons without trial at present exercised by the Home Secretary. The nature, quality, and direction of government depends entirely on who these ministers are. It is the King who in the first place chooses the Prime Minister and thus sets in motion the process of forming a government. Very often he has no real choice in the matter. One government has resigned and another party is called in. That party has an acknowledged leader and therefore he must be summoned. Sometimes, especially when the Prime Minister dies or retires through ill-health, the King has freedom of choice.

This happened in 1923 when King George V passed over the experienced and unpopular Lord Curzon and chose the popular and inexperienced Mr. Baldwin. It is not of course certain that the statesman summoned by the King will succeed in forming a government. The other members of the party may refuse to serve under him. But the odds are that he will succeed. He has the King's commission, and for a colleague to refuse to serve under him when he has recently been serving with him seems very much like sulking. The man who refuses to serve, unless he has a very good reason based on different ideas of policy, may be thought disloyal to his party and undutiful to his sovereign.

The Prime Minister

Armed with the King's command to form a government, the Prime Minister must distribute the principle ministries within a period of about forty-eight hours. In this short time he may take decisions more important than any he has to take afterwards. A bad appointment to a key position like the Foreign Office or the Air Ministry may cause untold harm, while another appointment may turn out to be a brilliant success. The Prime Minister is not altogether free in his appointments. The foremost leaders in his party or coalition of parties must be given a place somewhere. Occasionally a very important politician may demand a certain office, the Exchequer or the Foreign Office, and refuse to serve unless he is satisfied. The making of a cabinet is a delicate and difficult matter calling for good judgment, firmness, and tact. After the principal ministers have been appointed each has to be provided with an under-minister. These posts are filled usually by younger members of parliament whose chances of further promotion depend on their performance in subordinate office. The ministers too must be distributed over both Houses of Parliament, the majority nowadays being in the Commons. The

Chancellor of the Exchequer must be in the Commons since that House monopolises financial business. The Lord Chancellor, who is also the highest judge in the realm, must be in the Lords for he is the president of that house. When he has completed his task the Prime Minister submits his list of appointments to the King for his approval and it is then made public.

When the Cabinet is formed the Prime Minister must secure the assent of the other ministers to his policies, but he remains the leader of the Cabinet, of the House of Commons, and, if he was not so already, becomes the leader of the party. He is Chairman of the Cabinet, summons it to meet and lays down its agenda with the help of the cabinet secretariat which has existed since 1916. If a minister dies or resigns, the Prime Minister fills up the vacancy. The Cabinet never co-opts a new member. It must accept the Prime Minister's choice. But if the Prime Minister himself retires, then all the cabinet offices are held to be vacant and the new Prime Minister has a free hand in reconstructing the government, though the government has not met defeat and the same party is still holding office.

The Prime Minister also has to appoint to many non-political offices. Most of the royal patronage is in his hands. He nominates, of course always 'with submission' to the King, the highest judges, the bishops and other dignitaries of the Church, the Viceroy of India and colonial governors. Peerages, titles, and honours are also in his gift, even some academic positions such as the Regius professorships at the older universities. How and where he seeks advice is his own business. The personality of the Prime Minister therefore is felt in every branch of government and every corner of the kingdom.

It is important to note that in recent times the prime ministership has not been the monopoly of any one class. In this century our Prime Ministers have come from various

social strata. Of the nine men who have held office since 1902, two may be considered to come from the aristocracy, five from the middle class, and two from 'the people.' The aristocrats are Balfour and Churchill, one the nephew of a Marquis, the other the grandson of a Duke. Lloyd George and Ramsay Macdonald rose from very humble origins. Their places of education are worthy of note. Balfour—Eton; Campbell-Bannerman—Glasgow High School; Asquith—City of London School; Lloyd George—Llanystymdwy Church School; Bonar Law—Glasgow High School; Baldwin—Harrow; Macdonald—Drainie Village School; Chamberlain—Rugby; Churchill—Harrow. Their professions also have been varied. Churchill started as a soldier, Macdonald as a journalist and writer, Lloyd George as a solicitor, and Asquith a barrister, Bonar Law, Baldwin, and Chamberlain were business men, Balfour and Campbell-Bannerman had private means.

Four have been Englishmen, three Scotsmen, one Canadian-Scot, and one Welsh. Only three have been members of the Church of England.

The Cabinet

The Cabinet over which the Prime Minister presides was, until recently, a quite informal body unknown to the law of the constitution. Since 1937, however, it has been recognised by a statute which provides for equal pay for all members except the Prime Minister and Lord Chancellor, who receive twice as much as their colleagues. By this statute the names of ministers called to cabinet rank must be published in the London Gazette. The Cabinet, however, is a perfectly flexible institution. There is no fixed number of Cabinet Ministers. A normal Cabinet before the war consisted of over twenty members, but in the so-called crisis of 1931 it was cut down to ten in order to

work more quickly. During this war we have had a War Cabinet of six or seven members. The Cabinet, however, is not a body possessing powers in itself. But it wields the sum total of the powers of all the ministers. Thus in one day it may be decided that the Foreign Secretary shall send a note to a foreign power, the Minister of Health shall offer a housing subsidy to local authorities, the Minister of Labour shall issue certain instructions to all labour exchanges, the Admiralty shall order a new aircraft-carrier, the Home Secretary shall order certain changes in the prison system. The legal power to do all these things rests in the minister concerned. It is his *order*: it is the Cabinet's *decision*.

Only some questions come before the Cabinet, namely, very important matters, or contentious matters about which different departments cannot agree. The Cabinet then decides. If any minister thinks that the policy decided upon is utterly wrong, then he should resign. Otherwise he must loyally accept the decision, do his best to carry it out and, if necessary, defend it in public. Inside each government office decisions are being taken daily by individual ministers or being discussed with the Treasury if the policy in question requires the spending of public money.

The Civil Service

Each minister has at his command a large staff of professional administrators. These we call Civil Servants, or if we happen to dislike what they are doing at the moment, bureaucrats. The Civil Service even in normal times consists of several hundred thousands of men and women, including customs officers, postal officials, and so on. But the specialised, policy-controlling officials in the offices in Whitehall, the men whom the minister himself may send for to give him information or receive instructions, are a small body. Some, like medical, legal, or engineering

experts, are professional men who must have technical qualifications. The remainder are recruited in their early twenties by an intensely competitive examination from graduates of universities. This method of recruiting civil servants was one of the chief political inventions of the nineteenth century. It was put into general use by Gladstone in 1870. It has two great merits. It prevents ministers giving jobs by personal or political favour: it ensures a high degree of intellectual ability, for many of the ablest students from the universities compete annually and only about fifty are chosen.

Most of the successful candidates come from Oxford and Cambridge. It is sometimes thought that this is because the subjects of examination are those specially favoured at Oxford and Cambridge, classics and mathematics, or that the examiners are biassed in their favour. This is untrue. There is a wide selection of subjects, including the more modern studies, and the papers are numbered so that the examiners do not know whose paper they are marking. The explanation is that Oxford and Cambridge, with their large number of scholarships open to competition, attract the ablest schoolboys from all over the country Once appointed, the civil servant becomes an expert in the work of his department. It is his business to serve the minister whatever his political views may be. In the long run the policy he executes is that which parliament demands. But a weak, ignorant or lazy minister may be very much under the influence of his permanent staff. A strong, active and able minister will bend them to his will. The political influence of civil servants is usually exaggerated by the public. In peace-time people complain that these men in Whitehall govern us altogether; in war-time the complaint is that they are incapable of action.

Local Government

Beyond the central government in Whitehall lies a

complex structure of local authorities, whose work may play more part in the life of the ordinary citizen than the government in London. There are two forms of local authority. The shires which are now governed by County Councils and subdivided into urban and rural districts and parishes are very ancient units going back to the dim epoch of the Anglo-Saxons. The cities or towns, 'County Boroughs', may be ancient like London or York which go back to Roman times, or new towns built up in the last thirty years. In county or borough a popularly elected council levies a rate on the rentable value of property. It provides roads and streets, police, education, health and other services. But it is very far from being an independent body, for the revenue from local taxes is not enough even for the wealthiest borough. The central government makes grants-in-aid to local authorities. These take various forms, but recently the principle has been adopted of paying grants to local authorities according to their need, the wealth or poverty of the district, the percentage of unemployed, the number of school-children. Wherever the central government gives a subsidy it has the right of inspection and the power to control.

The Ministry of Health is the office in charge of local government, but the Ministries of Labour and Agriculture, the Home Office, and the Board of Education are also concerned. The texture of English social services and local government is made up by a complex interweaving of threads between the Town and County Halls and the Ministries in Whitehall. Parliament and Cabinet lay down the general principles. A prosperous and enlightened borough will provide better roads, schools, health, and welfare services than a poor or backward borough, but the major changes and policies are decided at the centre. More and more Englishmen's lives are governed by what parliament and the ministers entrusted with power by parliament decide.

Parliament

Parliament therefore is the key to British policy in great things or in small. It has three main duties. Each year it is called on to make provision for the service of His Majesty's Government. Each government department lays before the House of Commons a more or less detailed estimate for the expenditure of that department during the coming financial year. These estimates may be rejected or reduced but they cannot be increased. Only the Crown can ask for supply, and members of parliament are thereby checked from advocating expenditure on their own initiative. After the estimates have been accepted parliament must then approve of the necessary taxes or loans to cover the estimates and also the "consolidated fund charges," i.e., the interest on the national debt, and other items such as the salaries of the judges which are not voted annually. This financial business is begun early in the year and usually completed by the end of July.

The second duty of parliament is to make laws. No year passes in which it is not necessary to amend old law or make new law. Also, since in normal times the legal power to raise and discipline a standing army has to be voted each year, there is one act which parliament *must* pass.

Thirdly, parliament, in this case actually the House of Commons, designates the government. A party or a coalition of parties is in the majority of the Commons. The leader of this party is the man whom the King will summon to form a ministry. He will hold office as long as he retains the confidence of the House. There is no settled rule as to what constitutes a vote of no confidence. A government defeat in the House on a small matter will not bring down the ministry, but the refusal to vote supply or the rejection of a major legislative project introduced by the government, will be taken as an intimation by the House that the government must go. Sometimes a direct vote of censure is moved

stating in so many words that His Majesty's ministers no longer enjoy the confidence of the House. If defeated the ministry must either resign, and the King will send for the leader of the opposition, or else the Prime Minister will advise the King to dissolve parliament and let the electors decide the issue.

The House of Lords

A parliament is summoned by royal writs issued from the Chancery. These writs are of two kinds. Some are sent to the mayors of boroughs and sheriffs of counties, commanding them to hold elections for the House of Commons. Others are sent to individuals, commanding them to attend at Westminster for a parliament on a certain day. Those who receive these personal writs are the members of the House of Lords. This distinction between personal writs and general writs to the sheriffs is very old; it is found in Magna Carta. The Lords, or Peers of Parliament, consist of four main classes. First are the hereditary peers whose ancestors have been summoned to parliament and made lords. These form the majority of the House. Then there are those who have been made peers in their own lifetime and who form a more numerous and important element in the House than is usually realised. Their descendants will be hereditary peers. Then there are the archbishops and bishops of the Church, that is the twenty-six most senior of them. Finally there are certain high judges—the Lords of Appeal in Ordinary. They and the bishops are the only life members in the assembly.

Two hundred years ago the House of Lords was as important as the Commons, and most of the King's chief ministers were peers. By a slow process their power declined until in 1911 the Parliament Act was passed to limit their authority. This act removed from them the power to reject any money bill and left it to the Speaker of the Commons to define a money bill. It also provided that if the Commons

passed a bill three times in the space of not less than two years it would become law whether the Lords assented to it or not. This leaves the Lords with power to debate, to delay and obstruct, but not to put an insurmountable obstacle to the Commons' will. This Act has scarcely been tested, for in the last twenty-five years there has in fact been little friction between the two houses.

The House of Commons

In the Commons, then, is the focus and centre of all British government. The Prime Minister is there and most of his fellow ministers. On the opposition benches can be seen the Prime Minister presumptive and many of those who would form his cabinet. A political enthusiast from the Strangers' Gallery can see the public men whom he loves and hates and hear them doing their best and worst. In the Distinguished Strangers' Gallery foreign ambassadors may watch and report to their governments on the mood and feeling of the country, just as four hundred years ago the Venetian ambassador filled his despatches to the Council of that great republic with reports of what he heard was brewing in the Commons House. Hot and bitter as the debates may sometimes be, they are restrained by custom and good feeling and above all by respect for the authority of the Speaker, who arbitrates between Government and Opposition and calls members to order for any breach of the rules and the polite usages of the House. The Speaker's office is of great antiquity, as old as parliament itself. He is chosen as a man whose character all members will respect; he is re-elected irrespective of party feeling and he is expected to maintain complete impartiality. As the Prime Minister is the Leader of the House so is the Speaker its Judge.

The House of Commons is not merely a debating assembly. It has, as we have seen, duties to carry out in the governing of the country. Since in modern times there is always

great pressure of business, the standing orders of the House vest much power in the Government, and are devised to prevent frivolous interruption and waste of time. In an ordinary session business promoted by the Government has precedence of all other business on about seven days out of eight. If the Government desires to close a debate, the closure may be moved and passed by a majority vote of members. But it is for the Speaker to decide whether to accept this motion for the closure or not, for he is charged to see that the rights of the minority in the House are not infringed. The Government therefore makes the time-table of the House. It might seem that in this way it could avoid awkward questions and stifle criticism. But in fact it cannot do this, although the rules make it difficult for individual members to raise the subjects they would like to raise at the time they want to. But the Government cannot evade criticism. When the estimates for any department are voted, all the work of that department comes under review. Why have we not more destroyers, or aircraft? Why are rates of pay in the army unfair? Is the Minister of Health doing all that can be done to stamp out diphtheria? Is the President of the Board of Education really up to date in his ideas about the nutrition of school-children? Should not the Minister of Agriculture encourage the growth of different crops? Has the Secretary for Scotland nothing better to propose about the slums of Glasgow?

But the estimates are presented only once a year. When that opportunity is passed the members fall back on that remarkable institution of the House of Commons, Question Time. At the beginning of each sitting, members are allowed to put questions to ministers of the Crown. They must give notice of the questions beforehand and the questions must conform to certain rules enforced by the Speaker. Ministers will be in their place to answer them or will

arrange for a colleague to do so. In this way the Government can be raked fore and aft with a fire of implied criticism. It is sometimes said that questions to ministers have become an abuse because of the time that the departments have to give to preparing answers. But as long as the custom continues, British subjects will not lack a most effective means of ventilating their grievances.

If the Opposition wants to challenge the Government on some matter that is not coming up in the ordinary business routine, it asks for a day to debate the question and tables a hostile motion. The Government must allow the debate or be accused of cowardice.

Committees

The House of Commons, like all governmental deliberative bodies, makes use of committees. There is the Committee of the whole House which is not a committee in the real sense, but merely a slightly less formal meeting of the House to discuss finance or the details of a Bill. But to save the time of the House, most Bills are sent to standing committees of fifty or sixty members who act as a kind of sample of the House. There are also smaller Select Committees. These are appointed to investigate the procedure of the House and suggest improvements. They may be appointed to investigate any special problem of government or to clear up some alleged scandal. They may hear outside evidence and summon witnesses. Small committees are also used for what are called Private Bills. A better description of such bills would be 'particular'; they are bills of local or special import. If a borough wants to extend its boundaries or acquire new powers, if legal authority is required for a new railway line or electricity undertaking, a 'private' bill is promoted and a small committee of members will hear and decide the case for and against. The House as a whole rarely discusses such matters.

One form of committee usual in other parliaments is not

found in the House of Commons, namely committees relative to departments of government, such as War, Foreign Affairs, Finance, Education, Trade, etc. This may be a serious deficiency in our machinery of government and shortcomings during the period of rearmament might perhaps have been remedied if small, expert, and vigilant committees had been able to investigate the problem. The orthodox doctrine, however, is that such committees are baneful and weaken ministers' responsibility, although Mr. Lloyd George has given his formidable testimony on the other side. During this war a Select Committee on Public Expenditure has a roving commission to investigate activities of government and is said to have done good work.

Composition of the House

A modern House of Commons is composed of men of all classes and varied professions. There are always some heirs to peerages and at the same time men who have been manual workers, especially miners. There are men of great wealth and men who have known the extremes of poverty. More than a third of every House are university graduates; retired officers of the army and navy are there in some numbers; and barristers form an important element of any House, their legal knowledge and skill in pleading rendering them particularly useful members. Members are paid a salary of £600 a year. This is supposed to be enough to maintain a member but too little to make politics a paying profession. Financial difficulties indeed deter many men from standing for parliament, especially young men with families. Women have been eligible for membership since 1918. In January 1943, there were eleven women members. One woman has been a cabinet minister and more have been under-ministers. As the electorate has widened and made its influence felt, so the composition and social manners of the House have changed also, as was

shown some time ago when the Clydeside Socialist members induced the Kitchen Committee to supply the democratic northern meal, high tea. It was once supposed to be, though never quite accurately, an exclusive aristocratic club. It is so no longer.

The Electors

What then is the electorate which brings the House of Commons into existence? Who have the right to vote and what methods of voting are used? The broad answer is simple. The electors are the entire adult population of the country. It is a long journey which has led parliament to this goal. Until the famous Reform Bill of 1832, the parliamentary franchise was on a traditional basis. Each borough had its own law; some had a narrow franchise and some a broad franchise. In the counties the right to vote was laid down by a statute of King Henry VI in 1430; it was limited to those who held freehold land to the annual value of forty shillings. This law lasted 402 years. It was passed one year after the appearance of Joan of Arc, 23 years before the Turks captured Constantinople, 62 years before Columbus discovered America, 87 years before Luther started the Reformation, 346 years before the Declaration of Independence, and 359 years before the outbreak of the French Revolution. The Emperor Napoleon had been in his grave eight years before it was altered. Such is the continuity of English institutions.

During this long period parliament had successfully asserted its supremacy over the Church, over the Crown, over custom and common law, failing only in one thing, to maintain its supremacy over the colonies of North America. In 1832 the ice broke and parliament remodelled itself to meet the demands of the active and politically minded part of the people, who insisted that the representative system should no longer be fossilised but made real and rational. In the course of the next century there

followed progressive extensions of the right to vote which made our government a democracy. Different dates may be taken for the coming of democracy; the year 1867, when the working men of the towns were brought in; the year 1884, when the labouring classes in the countryside, farm-workers, and miners, were given the vote; the year 1918, when all adult males and women over thirty were enfranchised; the year 1928 when all women over twenty-one were admitted. Another possible date is the year 1911 when, by the Parliament Act, the House of Lords lost its power of vetoing absolutely the legislation of the Commons.

The franchise is universal; it is also very nearly equal. With two exceptions the rule of one man one vote prevails. The first exception is that an elector may vote twice, but no more, at one general election, if he is registered on different qualifications in two constituencies; for example, he may vote for his residence in a suburb and for his place of business in the city. The other exception is quaint and unusual in modern representative government. In 1603 King James I, the only very learned monarch who ever sat on the throne of England, sent writs to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge instructing them to return two members each to the House of Commons. They have done so ever since, and in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the Scottish universities and the newer universities of England, of Wales and of Northern Ireland have been added. This is the only sign of anything like functional or corporative representation in the House of Commons. Great corporate bodies may have much power, and sinister influence is often imputed by their enemies to the City of London, the Federation of British Industries, the Liquor Trade, the Trades Union Congress, Catholic or Jewish organisations, but that influence to be effective must be exercised on the members of parliament or on those who elect them. The university members are elected by all

graduates who are British subjects and the voting is by post Recently the university electors have shown a tendency to choose independent members instead of party men. As only twelve out of the 615 members of the House are elected by the universities the matter is of no great importance.

Conduct of Elections

All citizens have their names placed on the register of electors provided they have a permanent address and fill up the forms sent to the head of the household in each house. The vote is by ballot, that is, it is secret. The voter goes to the polling booth, usually a school, gives his name to the clerk, receives a paper which he takes to a curtained recess, and fills it up by placing a cross against the name of his candidate. The poll closes at eight or nine o'clock the same evening, and all the ballot boxes are taken to a central place, the shire or town hall. Counting may begin that night or may be delayed till next morning. The ballot boxes are opened and checked and the papers counted in one mass. It is not possible to tell how the different wards or polling districts in the constituency have voted. The returning officer is the Sheriff in all Scottish seats, the High Sheriff in English Counties, and the Mayor in English Boroughs. He employs the polling clerks and enumerators and decides all disputed questions. If any false practice is suspected in the conduct of the election a petition is presented and an enquiry is held by two Judges of the High Court. Candidates are limited in the amount of money they can spend in conducting the election according to the number of electors. If a candidate exceeds this allowance, or if he or his assistants offer any bribes or inducements, then he may be unseated and another election held.

Candidates

Any elector may offer himself as a candidate except Peers of the Realm who sit in the House of Lords, clergy

of the established church, and Roman Catholic priests, bankrupts or lunatics. But no one may sit in the House if he is being paid by the state, so civil servants, members of the armed forces, and persons contracting to supply the government are excluded. The candidate need not be a resident of the district. This is very important, for it enables men of merit to find a seat in any part of the kingdom. Sometimes a prominent politician is driven from pillar to post like the late Foreign Secretary, Mr. Arthur Henderson, who moved from County Durham to Widnes, from Widnes to Burnley, from Burnley to Derbyshire. Sometimes a man will sit for his native place, like Mr. Lloyd George, who has represented Carnarvon Boroughs for fifty-two years without a break. The cost of holding the election is borne by the state, but to prevent frivolous candidatures a deposit of £150 has to be made on nomination. This will be refunded unless the candidate receives less than one-eighth of the votes cast.

The Electoral System

With the exception of a few double-member boroughs the constituencies each return one member. At the last redistribution of seats in 1918, the constituencies were approximately equal, but population changes since then have produced inequalities. There is no provision in our electoral law to secure that the candidate declared elected shall be supported by the majority of the voters. If there are only two candidates the winner must have a majority, but if, as often happens, there are three or more candidates, the seat goes to the candidate with the larger number of votes even though they may be less than half. Devices like the second ballot or the alternative vote could easily be adopted to rectify this, but English opinion is on the whole satisfied with the system. It is what has always been. Ever

since sheriffs had to count heads in order to see who had been elected to parliament, the simple plurality rule has prevailed; a majority in the strict sense of more than half the votes has never been required.

While anyone who can raise £150 and secure eight electors to nominate him can become a candidate, the choice of candidates and the organisation of elections are in fact the work of political parties. The local association of the party in the constituency usually appoints its executive committee to find a candidate and then the association as a whole will approve of the choice or perhaps decide between more than one presented. If the local leaders can find no candidate of their own, then the central executive of the party in London is consulted. It will have a list of possible candidates and will suggest several names, perhaps a young journalist or barrister anxious to go into politics, perhaps an experienced leader who is for the moment without a seat. He will come down and be adopted even if he has never seen the constituency before. The American term 'carpet-bagger' is used to denote such candidates, but it is not a term of abuse, except in so far as the other side may use it to point the contrast with their own local candidate, "Mr. Blank whom you all know, a Blankshire man for a Blankshire seat." Many of our greatest statesmen have been carpet-baggers, Mr. Churchill, for instance, who has sped from Oldham to Manchester, to Dundee, to Essex. The central executive of the party cannot compel the local party to accept a candidate whom it sends. But if the local association wants financial help from the centre, as it often does, then the central body has the whip hand. Moreover, if the member elected is unorthodox or disloyal, then he may be expelled from the party by "refusing him the whip." This means that he will no longer receive the summons and instructions sent out to members by the chief whip or party manager. Unless he can retain the confidence of his local

supporters and he or they can produce enough funds to fight a contest, he will not be renominated at the next election.

The Party System

The rules and conventions of the English party system are all devised for two parties only. In the House of Commons, which is rectangular in shape, a member is expected to sit on the Speaker's right with the Government, or with the Opposition on the Speaker's left. Party politics go back to the reign of Charles II (1660–1685) when the Whig and Tory parties arose. Of these the Whigs were the enemies and the Tories the supporters of royal authority. By the nineteenth century these two parties had become the Liberals and the Conservatives, and in spite of many changes and contradictions something of the old differences between them survived. The Liberals were the party of "progress, reform, improvement, liberty." The Tories, now Conservatives, were the party of authority, tradition, conservatism. The Conservatives were the supporters of, and were supported by, the Established Church. The Liberals were aided by the Nonconformists. The Conservatives were strong in Southern England and in rural and residential areas, the Liberals in Scotland, Wales, and Northern England, and in mining and industrial areas.

In 1906 the Labour party began to be prominent and in 1919 it became the most effective opposition to the Conservatives. Thus, we had a three-party system. This was awkward for a nation accustomed to think in the plain terms of yea and nay with only two parties. One way of facing the situation was to pretend that it did not exist, to say that there was only one issue and that people must form up into two parties to decide that issue. This was the Labour view; either you were for or against the workers, for or against the capitalist system. But the threefold division was real. A Conservative might think that the chief issue was the

danger of socialism, but none the less he could not get on with the Liberals, whom he thought priggish, doctrinaire, and unpractical. The Liberal thought the Conservatives to be stupid and arrogant but, much as he longed to overthrow them, he could not ally with the Labour party for he did not believe in socialism and he could not suppose 'the workers' to be always right. He believed that nobody could be always right except himself in knowing it to be impossible so to be. So with the Liberals ground between the upper and nether millstones of conservatism and socialism, our politics were conducted on a three-party basis. Because of our electoral system this produces strange results.

Under the two-party system, if a party gains a decisive victory at an election the majority it has in the House of Commons will probably be greater in proportion than its actual majority among the electors. This was in some ways an advantage, for it gave the Government a better working majority in the House. But under the three-party system it has happened that a party with a minority in the electoral vote may get a large majority in the House of Commons. This happened in the Conservative victories of 1922 and 1924. Now this is not what representative parliamentary democracy is supposed to mean. But it has a rough justification in common sense. That party which has the largest amount of support, even if it is not in an actual majority, is entitled to govern the country. No other party has as good a title. If the system benefits one party to-day, another party may benefit from it to-morrow, or if the opposition parties object, then let them unite and so form a majority of the electors. It is more important that some party should have a disciplined coherent majority in the House than that abstract electoral justice should be done.

The majority of British citizens undoubtedly accept this rough and ready answer. It is only a minority who declare that the matter must be dealt with by a reform of the

electoral system which would set up proportional representation. Proportional representation would have the effect of ensuring that a party would not secure a majority of the House unless and until it had a majority in the electorate. Each party would be represented more or less according to the number of voters it attracted. This would have two advantages; it would make the practice of our elections square with the theory, and even in Anglo-Saxon countries there is some value in harmonising theory and practice: it would mean that parliament was dominated by the medium or moderate view in politics and not by one of two extreme views. On the other hand it can be argued that to give the middle party always a balancing power is just as much a departure from true representation as to favour the extreme parties.

How the country would have fared for the last twenty years under proportional representation no one can tell. Analogies from other countries are deceptive. Ireland, which has proportional representation, has changed governments only once, Belgium many times. France, which had not proportional representation, changed government many times and Canada seldom. We do know what did happen in this country. In the twenty years between the wars we have had for seventeen years a large conservative majority in the House of Commons, either a pure party majority as in 1922 and 1924, or a coalition basically conservative as in 1918, 1931, and 1935 For three years, 1924 and 1929-31, there was a Labour Government without a clear party majority. On the whole we have enjoyed the advantages, such as they are, of 'strong' governments, meaning by strong, governments that have not had to fear from day to day that a mercurial legislature would turn them out.

But our electoral system, combined with the tendency to electoral landslides which universal suffrage and especially women's suffrage seems to bring, has had the effect of

making our governments, safe between elections because of rigid party discipline, feel extremely unsafe at elections. The stakes at an election are very high. If you can poll, not necessarily half the votes in the country, but substantially more than either of the other two parties, then you may capture two-thirds of the House. The whole machine of government is in your hands. You can give the country the government which you think is right for a full five years. There is no doubt whatever what the doctrine of the British Constitution is as to the duty of members. This was laid down by Burke when he said that a member owes his electors not his obedience but his judgment. He is there to do what he thinks is right. There is no system of recalling him or making him a delegate. But in practice politicians have to ask themselves what the electors are going to say at the end of the five years. If by doing what is right you make yourselves unpopular, you hand over the government to your enemies who are in your opinion wrong-headed, bad-blooded, and incompetent. Is it not better to temporise, to do rather less than you think is right in order to stave off a worse evil? There are many signs that such feelings did affect our rulers in the past twenty years. In foreign policy they had to speak in terms of the League of Nations and collective security, without really believing in these things or indeed, in the case of many of them, knowing what they meant. For if they lost votes by doing what they thought right on foreign policy, then all the advantages they enjoyed under the electoral system would go to the other side, that is to say, to the socialists and this, so it was said, meant national ruin. It may be asked whether this does not show a radical defect in the system of government and whether we shall not have the same difficulties after the war. Whatever course party politics may take after the war it is probably safe to say that there will be much less fear of 'national ruin'. We have learned

so much about national ruin in so many forms that it will not be the same sort of bogey. It would probably be an illusion to suppose that Englishmen will love each other more after the war, but having looked Nazi Germany in the face across the Straits of Dover, they may fear each other less. Governments may be more willing to accept the ideas of the great classic age of our parliamentary government, the days of Gladstone and Disraeli, to do what they think is right and even ride for a fall. Defeat in the sense of a mere electoral defeat will perhaps seem less terrible to men who lived through the summer of 1940. Proletarian Russia may seem less terrible to those who have known her as an ally and capitalist America less odious to those who have used her armaments, been sustained by her food, and fought with her soldiers.

One thing at least may be said about living under the rule of universal suffrage. It used to be feared that under extreme democracy the masses would ask for nothing but bread and circuses and would shrink from sacrifices. Yet in the financial crisis of 1931 it was the Conservatives who proposed to lower wages, raise taxes, and reduce doles and were swept into power in triumph, while it was the Socialists, who promised to preserve all these good things, that were left complaining of mass hysteria and popular fallacies. And during this war it is the ministers who have asked for most sacrifice that have been the most popular. Blood, toil, sweat, and tears is not the slogan that would formerly have been considered a good cry for a demagogue, but politicians vie with each other now in offering these commodities. Indeed, historians in the distant future may be hard put to it to decide whether our system of government in this epoch is more to be blamed for the fact that this war with a recently defeated and disarmed enemy ever began, or praised for the qualities that have enabled us thus far to endure it.

OXFORD PAMPHLETS ON HOME AFFAIRS
No. H 3

THE TRANSITION FROM WAR TO PEACE

BY
A. C. PIGOU

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON : HUMPHREY MILFORD
1943

Britain's resources—slowly at first, but with gathering speed—have been mobilized until the whole energies of the nation have been directed into war channels. This has meant an enormous shift of employment. Millions of men and women have entered the Services. Millions more have turned from the production of peace-time needs to war-production. Unemployment has disappeared (we all know, now, how Hitler did it).

What is going to happen when the machinery goes into reverse gear? How will the transition back again to peace-time production be effected? Will those who were employed before the war get back to their old jobs? Will those who have reached employable age during the war find jobs? What are the prospects? What the dangers, and how can we avoid them?

These questions, and others, are the subject of this pamphlet. The author suggests the answer to them, both by describing our present probable prospects, and by looking for guidance—and warning—to what happened after the last war.

Professor Pigou is Professor of Political Economy at Cambridge, and the author of many books on economics, including *The Economics of Welfare*, *The Political Economy of War*, *Economics in Practice*, and *Socialism* versus *Capitalism*.

A forthcoming Pamphlet in this series will deal with the question whether Full Employment is possible.

First published March 1943
First published in India December 1943

Printed at the Diocesan Press, Madras, India and published by
THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, *Amen House, E.C.4.*
LONDON EDINBURGH GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO
MELBOURNE CAPETOWN BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS
HUMPHREY MILFORD *Publisher to the University*

THE TRANSITION FROM WAR TO PEACE

THE problems of transition from war to peace must be in great part political; provisions for security against aggression, the re-unification of France, the adjustment of disputed frontiers, and so on. There is a grave warning in a recent pronouncement by Lord Cecil: 'Believe me, we are in for an extremely difficult period after the war. I do beg you to consider what is the condition of large tracts of Europe at the present time, and it certainly will not be any better, it will be worse by the time we reach the peace. The whole of the governments of many countries have been destroyed; Czecho-slovakia, practically no government left except a dictatorship from Berlin; Yugoslavia, the most vigorous part of the population wandering in the mountains and forests of that country and maintaining guerilla war; the occupied districts of Russia in much the same situation; and so it is in many of the other countries. This is the situation you will have to deal with.'[1] With these things, however, this pamphlet is not concerned. Nor will it endeavour to cover the whole field even of economic problems. Many of the difficulties to be dealt with will be international in scope. The provision of food and equipment for devastated countries will be an inescapable obligation on Great Britain and on the United States, and one the execution of which may well entail some postponement of our own less urgent needs. But, though international and national problems are necessarily in some degree interlocked, the latter group only, not the former, will be studied here: This entails that many important matters must be left aside, but it will be possible, by way of compensation, to handle the others more fully.

[1] Presidential Address to the General Council of the League of Nations Union, 20 November 1942.

The Transfer from War-work to Peace-work

The dominant *immediate* change that the return of peace must bring about is the shifting of an enormous mass of national effort away from the service of war. Vast numbers of men now engaged in the armed Forces will no longer be wanted there; vast numbers of men and women now engaged in producing munitions of all sorts will also no longer be wanted for that work. No figure for the reduction in aggregate war service will be hazarded. For not only are data lacking, but also it is impossible to define war service with any precision. What proportion of coal miners, for example, would it be reasonable to describe as engaged in war and what proportion in civilian service? But, no matter what definition we take, it is obvious that the contraction in war service when peace returns will be enormous.

It would be a serious mistake, however, to suppose that the number of persons whose employment on war service will cease is equivalent to the number that will want employment in civilian industry. The latter number will in fact be substantially smaller than the former. For during the war a substantial number of men who would normally have retired have remained in industry; children have gone to work at an unusually early age; and above all, a large number of women have come into industry who were normally engaged in looking after their own homes. With the return of peace these persons, or, more accurately, an equivalent number of persons, will not desire employment. Moreover, there are bound to be men demobilized from the Forces who will have been rendered by wounds or illness unfit for work. There is reason to believe that during the

year following the last war well over a million persons, men and women together, in one or another of these categories, withdrew of their own motion from industrial activity ; thus reducing the number seeking civilian work substantially below the number unable any longer to obtain war-work.

Yet, again, it must be borne in mind that for many people a shift from war-work to civilian work will not entail a shift of personal employment. It is true, of course, that every man demobilized from the Forces and desiring work will need a different job and a different employer. But a great many persons in industry, who cease to work indirectly for the war machine, may hope to continue at very nearly the same job and with the same employer as during the war. No shift of employment is needed when railways turn from carrying troops and munitions to carrying civilian goods, while many firms, that have in war-time done engineering work for the Government, may be expected in peace-time to set their men to work on very similar jobs in the manufacture of civilian goods. Thus the number of men and women transferred from job to job and place to place on the return of peace will, so far as civilian war-workers are concerned, be very much fewer than those transferred from the service of war to the service of peace.

During the 18 months following the last war round about 4 million men, say 3½ million in the wage-earning classes, were demobilized from the Forces. Towards the close of that war it was estimated by the Civil War Workers' Committee that 900,000 persons (probably many more) in industry would, on the return of peace, in consequence of the cessation of war orders, find their jobs closed down. A grand total of, say, 4½ million persons ! It must be remem-

bered, indeed, that, whereas in 1919 our armed Forces were cut down very rapidly to the pre-war scale, at the conclusion of the present war it may prove necessary to retain for many years much larger Forces and much more equipment than we have ever maintained before in times of peace. This is an important consideration but, after all, only a secondary one. The essential point remains. The transition from war to peace, throwing, as it must do, vast numbers of men and women out of direct and indirect forms of war work, is bound to create, as it did create in 1919, an assembly of persons, less vast indeed, but nevertheless large, for the moment deprived of employment and anxiously seeking after it in one or another civilian occupation.

A Large Immediate Post-war Demand for Labour Probable

In view of this, it is of the first importance to know what the state of civilian requirements, when the war is over, is likely to be. Will there be enough demand for work at civilian tasks to absorb those men and women who still desire paid work, but whom the war no longer needs? So far as the *immediate* post-war situation is concerned there is not much doubt about the answer to that question. As soon as peace returns a great deal of work will be wanted to deal with war damage. Many houses and other buildings, that have been hit by bombs, will need repair or reconstruction. A great deal of work will also be called for to bring up again to full efficiency railways, ships, plant and equipment, which have suffered wear and tear and depreciation. The working capital of industry will have been

seriously depleted, the stocks of many things in factories, warehouses, and shops having been greatly cut down. These will have to be built up again. The same thing is true of the furniture, crockery, glass, and clothes in the hands of private people. A vast process of re-stocking will be called for. There may well, too, be heavy demands on our export industries, to serve, probably in part on credit, the needs of many war-ravaged countries. All this is over and above the call that the public, forced for so long to a low level of consumption, will make for less austere living. There is thus a strong presumption that the return of peace will be followed very shortly by a period of great activity in civilian industries. This forecast is abundantly supported by the evidence of last time. By the spring or early summer of 1920, whether we judge from the statistics of out-of-work donation or from the Trade Union unemployment returns or from those furnished in connection with the Unemployment Insurance Acts, it is clear that the number of persons involuntarily out of work was very small indeed; that substantially the whole body of those ejected by the ending of the war and desirous of continuing paid work had been absorbed into civilian industry.

Problems of Adjustment between Worker and Job

Granted, however, that the immediate post-war civilian demand is likely to prove sufficient, this does not imply that there will be no immediate post-war problems. On the contrary, there are bound, for a short time, to be serious difficulties of adjustment between pegs and holes. Something might be done to meet these by arranging the order of

demobilization from the Forces and from munition work in such a way as to help a speedy resumption of civilian activities. Thus, after the last war an attempt was made to release from the army at an early stage the key men of industry, without whom work could not easily be started, and others for whom immediate employment was guaranteed. But not very much can be done along these lines; the demand for prior demobilization for men of long service and married men is bound, as it did in 1919, to prove too insistent. Already it has been officially announced on behalf of the Government that after the war the order of demobilization will be based in the main on age and length of service.[1] For displaced civilian war workers, whose jobs are likely to come to an end very suddenly, there is even less scope for an ordered demobilization. In the main, therefore, it would seem, attention must be concentrated on insuring that those persons who inevitably in the process of transfer will suffer temporary loss of work do not also suffer distress. In 1918-1919, when there was as yet no general system of unemployment insurance or assistance, an elaborate scheme of out-of-work donation was instituted for this purpose, applicable alike to members of the Forces and to civilian war workers. Now we possess a highly efficient system of unemployment benefit and assistance, which, if the Beveridge Plan, or something similar to it, is adopted, should, by the time the war ends, have been still further improved. We may, therefore, be fairly confident that the task of safeguarding from distress persons transferred from war to peace service in the immediate post-war period—the first six

[1] Sir William Jowitt, House of Commons Speech, *Manchester Guardian*, 2 December 1942.

months or so following the armistice—will be dealt with adequately. I shall not, therefore, discuss it further.

About this immediate period of transfer and adjustment two other points should, however, be made. First, with the large number of persons that must be then suddenly thrown on the labour market, there is a risk that wage-earners, at all events in some occupations, will find themselves at a disadvantage in bargaining and so may be forced to accept large reductions in rates of pay. At the end of the last war this danger loomed large. To obviate it and the unrest which, if it were realized, would inevitably follow, the Government on 21 November 1918 passed through Parliament the Wages (Temporary Regulation) Act. The main purpose of this Act was 'to secure the maintenance for a period of six months [afterwards extended to September 1920] of the minimum wages generally applicable at the date of the signing of the Armistice, in each trade or branch of a trade or district, to each class of workmen, except in so far as these minimum wages are varied by arbitration or by agreement.' [1] In the conditions immediately following the Armistice some such Act was obviously a wise precaution. Nor does the fact that a few months later the tendency of wages was upwards prove that it was superfluous; for immediately after the outbreak of peace untoward happenings might easily have taken place. It would plainly be sound policy for the Government to safeguard the interests of wage-earners in the same way when the present war ends.

The second point—for the danger I have just been speaking of is probably not great—is much more important. The

[1] *Labour Gazette*, November 1918, p. 485.

war has impinged upon the life of many young men and called them into the armed Forces at that stage when they would normally have been working at Universities or engaged in some other form of education or training. Now the ordinary occupations of civil life demand entrants and, to obtain them, offer pay. Education at training institutions stands on a different footing. Entrants do not receive payments, they make them. In view of the upheaval which their lives have undergone, many of these young men will not be able to provide these payments out of their own or their parents' means ; and yet it is vital both for themselves and in the general interest that the educational opportunities, of which they have been deprived, should be postponed only, not irretrievably lost. In 1919 the State freely recognized its obligation in this matter. Thus already in the middle of December 1918, schemes for higher education and training were announced and students were given grants for University education. In the following February a scheme of State assistance to enable men to complete apprenticeships which had been interrupted by war service was announced. An Industrial Training department of the Ministry of Labour was formally constituted to organize training for demobilised ex-Service men and civilian war-workers and to control, in place of the Ministry of Pensions, training, other than curative, for disabled men. In principle, this arrangement was obviously sound, and something of the same kind will need to be done when the present war ends. In the statement of Government policy as regards demobilization already referred to, Sir William Jowitt assured the House of Commons that ' the question of education and training for the young, whose educational

careers were interrupted by the war, will not be overlooked.'

The Period of 'Delayed Depression'

So far it has been tacitly assumed that the transition from war to peace is fully accomplished when the makers and users of swords have, in the immediate post-war period, turned themselves into makers of plough-shares. But this assumption cannot stand. The transition is bound to be a long drawn-out affair, of which the first year or so of peace constitutes only the initial phase. That this must be so the reader will have already inferred from what was said about the probable characteristics of the immediate post-war demand. A large part of that demand is sure, as we have seen, to arise out of the need to make good war damage, to carry out postponed repairs to equipment and to restock factories, warehouses, shops, and private houses. That is to say, a large part of it will be a once-for-all, not a continuing, demand. When the repairs and restockings have been accomplished a chapter will be closed. It is as though the construction of a railway system, which had been occupying a great deal of labour for a long time, was finished and the demand associated with it shut down. Thus we should expect a second phase following the first—a phase of relatively contracted demand, in which a number of would-be workers may well find themselves without a job—a delayed post-war depression linked with and partly caused by the high activity of immediate post-war days. This period, with its many and complex problems, belongs to, indeed is an integral part of, the transition from war to peace. Let us once more look for guidance at what happened after the last war.

Some eighteen months after the Armistice the period of keen demand for labour, which till then had been gathering force for a year, drew to its close, to be followed by a tremendous and devastating decline. The percentage of unemployment recorded by Trade Unions, which had been less than 1 per cent. in April 1920, was over 10 per cent. in the following March (before the outbreak of the great coal strike), while the corresponding percentages among insured work-people were 2·8 per cent. and 15·4 per cent. The *Labour Gazette* for January 1921 describes the earlier part of this movement as follows :—

'In July, August and September a decline in employment, which had already become apparent in certain trades, especially boot and shoe manufacture, leather tanning and currying, cotton weaving, and the hosiery and jute trades, gradually spread to a considerable number of other industries, and by the beginning of October a depression was reported in most branches of the textile and clothing trades, and in the boot and shoe and leather trades. In October and November the shortage of fuel, caused by the general stoppage of work at the coal mines, which continued for over two weeks (18 October–3 November), resulted in general slackness and much unemployment and short-time working in nearly all the principal industries. There was a partial recovery shortly after the settlement of the strike, but the improvement proved only temporary, and, after a renewed decline during December, employment at the end of the year was slack in most of the principal industries.' Under the influence of the great 1921 coal stoppage, which began in April of that year, the situation greatly worsened.

In June the Trade Union unemployment figure was 20·6 per cent. and the insurance figure 22·4 per cent. When the stoppage came to an end there was, of course, an improvement. The Trade Union figure for July was 16·9 per cent. and the other figure 17·9 per cent. During the latter half of 1921 and throughout 1922 the improvement continued; but even at the end of 1922 the Trade Union figure was still 13·8 per cent. and the insurance figure 12·8 per cent. (14·5 per cent. for males and 8·1 per cent. for females). Production as a whole in this country in 1922 was, say, 15 per cent. less than in 1920.

This history shows a warning light. Will it be repeated? That there must be some tendency towards contraction when post-war repairs, re-equipment, and restocking are finished seems inevitable; and, unless special means are taken to resist it, it can hardly fail to manifest itself in reduced employment. But is it inevitable for the tendency to be on the enormous scale of 1920-1922; or were there special factors then in play which it may be possible next time to keep out of the field? With these questions we are brought face to face with the monetary aspects of the post-war situation.

Monetary Policy: Lessons from the Boom and Slump of 1919-1922

When the prospects of business are good, as they are bound to be while the ravages of war are being repaired and depleted stocks filled, business men, to finance their activity, at once turn over their existing balances more rapidly and try to secure further balances by borrowing from banks.

These processes normally lead to rising prices and rising money incomes. In 1919, after a few months of hesitation following the Armistice, the business world felt the urge of spring and moved forward with ever-growing confidence. 'With the comparatively small volume of American competition, which is bound to get smaller, with Germany, Belgium, Russia and other pre-war rivals practically out of the race and with the world's hunger for steel to satisfy, the trading opportunities for British steel are golden. The prospects of spinners and manufacturers in Lancashire were never brighter than at the moment. Large profits continue to be made and big dividends declared. Although, since the beginning of the year, extensive business has been done, there are no indications of markets abroad being over-supplied; it is believed that all cloth made in Lancashire during the next two or three years will be needed. When it becomes possible to observe the economic effects of the recent war in true perspective it will probably be found that the most outstanding result is a new lease of life for British trade.'[1] These sentiments were beyond doubt greatly strengthened by the avowed policy of the Government to have done with all industrial controls, priority arrangements, price maxima, and rationing of consumers' purchases at the earliest possible date. They were given extra scope by the Government's decision in March 1919, in the face of a warning from the Committee on Financial Facilities, to allow companies without restriction to put on the market new securities whose proceeds were to be applied inside the United Kingdom, and in the

[1] Extracts from articles and correspondence in *The Economist*, 18 and 25 October 1919.

following November to free from control all sorts of new securities. The boom ran on till the spring of 1920. At that date the well-known index number of wholesale prices prepared by the *Statist* newspaper was more than 37 per cent. higher than it had been at the Armistice, and monthly money income may well have been running 50 per cent. higher than in January 1919. During the boom year as a whole, from April 1919 to April 1920, there was an expansion in the number of persons in remunerated work, when increases in civilian occupations are set against decreases in the armed Forces, of probably about half a million; an expansion, that is to say, of some 3 per cent. The history of other industrial fluctuations suggests strongly that a recovery of employment on this scale could have been 'carried' by a very much smaller monetary boom.

In the spring of 1920, the monetary boom checked and then broke, to be followed by a monetary slump, even more tremendous. By the end of 1921, the *Statist*'s index number of wholesale prices had collapsed to half what it had been at the peak of the boom, so that it stood 32 per cent. below its level at the time of the Armistice. What happened was not, as is often supposed, a consequence of deflation by the banks, in the sense of a contraction of the quantity of money in existence. Bank deposits, as represented by the deposits of the London Clearing banks, did not contract. On the contrary, till August 1922, in all except three separate months, they were higher than they had been in April 1920. It was a consequence of the decisions by business men not to *use* their money—to turn over their balances much less rapidly than they had been doing. The immediate need for post-war repairs and restocking was by April 1920

mostly satisfied; so that openings of which industry had been availing itself were no longer there to be exploited. Thus the avalanche was ripe to fall. On the 15th April, Bank Rate, which had been put up from 5 per cent. to 6 per cent. in November 1919, was raised to 7 per cent. This gave a jolt to confidence, and was, it may well be, the spark that fired the tinder and initiated the downward movement.

But why was the movement so large? One reason, no doubt, is that the preceding large-scale boom had carried on its back a number of unsound enterprises, whose nakedness was now revealed. When an exaggerated optimism dies, an exaggerated pessimism is apt to arise from its ashes. Moreover, since in a violent boom industrial activity becomes geared to the expectation of *rising* prices, a mere arrest of the rise leads to heavy losses, and so brings about contraction and a fall.

But the main explanation is not to be found there. From March 1919, when the American exchange was 'unpegged,' i.e. ceased to be supported by Government action, and the Gold Standard was formally abandoned, it was a settled policy of the British Government—a policy which scarcely any person of authority then disputed—to re-establish that standard at pre-war parity at the earliest possible moment. This policy made it necessary for the banking authorities, so far as they could, to resist falls and to stimulate rises in the New York rate of exchange. It was with this in view that, after the boom had conclusively broken and when prices were falling rapidly, a 7 per cent. Bank Rate was retained for nearly a year, an arrangement, which, both directly and still more through its influence on business psychology, must have greatly intensified the slump.

The damage done was accentuated by the fact that, while prices were tumbling down, money wage-rates did not follow suit. Until the first month of 1921 they continued, under the impulse of the preceding boom, to rise substantially, so that between April 1920 and January 1921 they had actually increased by 17 per cent. in the face of a price fall of 25 per cent.; and, while during the course of 1921 itself they fell again absolutely (by some 20 per cent.), relatively to prices they were still rising slightly. This lagging of money wages behind the associated price movement, which is a natural, probably an inevitable, accompaniment of a heavy monetary slump, struck with great severity at business profits, and was bound to entail a serious contraction of employment. During 1922 itself the delayed-action fall of money-wages continued sharply though prices had nearly come to rest; thus, along with the reduction in the Bank Rate, which, by the middle of that year, had been brought down to 3 per cent., contributing to an improvement in the employment situation.

The moral of this history is fairly plain. After the war of 1914–18 money got out of hand. There was a violent monetary boom, much larger than was needed to carry the industrial readjustment, followed by a still more violent monetary slump. This transformed what might have been a moderate shrinkage of employment into a catastrophic collapse. It is *not* inevitable that at the end of the present war these events should repeat themselves. By refraining from a too rapid removal of industrial controls, by continuing the system of priorities, price maxima, and rationing, until shortages have been made good, and by exercising supervision over new issues of securities, the Government should

be able to prevent the occurrence of an immediate post-war monetary boom. This, of itself, should do much towards preventing a subsequent slump. If such a slump is threatened, the banking authorities, not this time having their hands tied by an obligation to restore a pre-war gold parity, will be free to adopt a discount policy calculated to counter rather than to accentuate it. Moreover, the post-war credits, savings certificates and so on, which the public will have accumulated, and for which cash can be demanded from the State at short notice, if only they are held back from use for a year or so after the war stops—and, since rationing is likely to continue for some time, this may well happen—will be available to be thrown in with great advantage in the form of a compensating new demand for consumption goods at the time when the demand for repairs and restocking is coming to an end. Thus, though the history of 1919 to 1922 gives warning of serious dangers, these fortunately are of a kind which 'happily foreknowing may avoid'.

Effect on Industry of Shrinking Exports

But our subject is not yet exhausted. In the early 1920's, when the alarums and excursions of the post-war boom and slump had died away, it became evident that the industrial structure of the country had undergone a very important change. Without attempting to go into the matter in detail, we may distinguish four developments that strongly affected demand conditions here First, a number of countries, which had previously been accustomed to obtain manufactured goods from the great industrialized countries, notably from Great Britain, being shut off during the war

from their sources of supply, started producing for themselves, and, after the war, naturally made strong efforts to maintain their new industries. Thus Japan and India became considerable manufacturers of textile goods, with the result that British-made textiles were less needed. Secondly, war shortages in Europe had caused a very large acreage of land in the New World to be turned over to agriculture—a development which those who had undertaken it were unwilling after the war to undo. Thirdly, at the same time technical agricultural improvements had increased productivity. These changes led, when European agriculture began to recover, to very cheap prices for agricultural products. Since British demand for these products is not very elastic, we were able to get what we needed of them in exchange for a reduced quantity of exports; or, to put the same point in other language, foreign producers of agricultural goods, having to sell them cheap, had not the means to buy so much of our exports as before. Fourthly, in the period following the war the quantity of investment abroad, in real terms, i.e. when allowance is made for the changed level of prices, undertaken by this country was substantially smaller than it had been before 1914. Mr. Colin Clark puts the money value of our overseas investments in 1907 at 138 million, in 1924 at 72 million.[1] Since prices were much higher in the latter than in the former year the proportionate reduction in real terms was, of course, much greater than in money terms.

All these four influences, it will be noticed, struck specially heavily at those of our industries whose products entered into the export trade. The demand for the output of these

[1] *National Income and Outlay*, p 185.

industries was still further handicapped by the disorganization of foreign currencies, difficulties about credit, and the attempts of many countries to close or restrict their markets by import prohibitions, quotas, tariffs, and exchange regulations designed to defend their endangered currencies from collapse. In view of all these things it is not surprising that the volume, as measured by values adjusted to 1913 prices, of our exports, did not, in any of the years down to 1926, rise above three-quarters, or, allowance being made for changes in quality, say, four-fifths of what it had been in 1913. In this connection Dr. Bowley wrote :—'The actual falling off of British exports is not only widespread geographically, but also it extends over all the principal manufactures for export. . . . In addition to the actual loss of labour in production of these goods there is the loss of transport by sea and land and of all the incidental business arising from foreign trade. It has been estimated that before the war nearly one-quarter of the national income depended on production for export, while in 1924 the proportion was only one-fifth.'[1] All this obviously meant a very considerable shift in the general pattern of our industries.

Labour Surpluses and Shortages

Even, however, had there been no such shift, there must have been serious awkwardness. Of ex-Servicemen returning to civil life the great majority would naturally try in the first instance to move back into their pre-war occupations. Many of them, indeed, had had their former jobs kept open for them. But, of persons who had entered gainful employ-

[1] *Some Economic Consequences of the Great War*, pp. 206-

ment for the first time during the war and wanted to continue in it, the majority, having no skill for any kind of job except the one they were actually doing, would try, when things had settled down, to stay where they were. Hence we should expect to find the proportion of the population seeking employment in industries that had been swollen during the war to be somewhat larger, and the proportion seeking it in those that had been contracted somewhat smaller, than before. Prominent among the war-expanded industries were, of course, engineering, shipbuilding, vehicles, iron and steel and metal industries. It is, therefore, specially interesting to find that over three-quarters of the total increase of the male industrial population of working age between the 1911 and 1921 censuses became attached to this small group of occupations.

Looking at the matter more generally, we see that the post-war distribution of would-be wage-earners seeking work among different occupations was mainly based on what the comparative demands for labour in these occupations were before the war and on what they had become during the course of it. But the levels of demand for labour in different occupations when things had settled down were determined by the circumstances and the prospects visible then. These, of course, were quite different from pre-war and during-the-war prospects. An inevitable consequence was a wide divergence between the proportions in which wage-earners were wanted and the proportions in which they were offering themselves for various kinds of work.

This is well brought out by the following table for Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Industry	*Unemployed Percentages 1924*
Shipbuilding and Ship Repairing	29·4
Dock, Harbour, River and Canal Service	25·6
Steel Smelting and Iron Puddling Furnaces, Iron and Steel Rolling Mills and Forges	21·1
Shipping Service	19·5
Public Works Contracting, etc.	17·8
Road Transport not separately specified	15·4
General Engineering, Engineers' Iron and Steel Founding	15·2
Cotton	13·7
Textile Bleaching, Printing, Dyeing, etc.	12·7
Hotel, Boarding House and Club Services	12·3
Metal Industries not separately specified	11·4
Building	10·6
Tailoring	9·5
Bread, Biscuits, Cakes, etc.	9·4
Boots, Shoes, Slippers and Clogs	9·2
National Government	9·1
Chemicals	9·0
Construction and Repair of Motor Vehicles, Cycles and Aircraft	8·5
Dressmaking and Millinery	7·5
Furniture-Making, Upholstering, etc.	7·2
Local Government	7·2
Drink Industries	7·0
Woollen and Worsted	7·0
Hosiery	6·9
Distributive Trades	6·6
Laundries, Dyeing and Dry Cleaning	6·2
Gas, Water and Electricity Supply Industries	6·1
Railway Service	5·8
Coal-mining	5·7
Printing, Publishing and Book-binding	5·4
Commerce, Banking, Insurance and Finance	4·9
Professional Services	4·0
Tramway and Omnibus Service	3·2
All Industries	10·3

(Rearranged from Beveridge, *Unemployment, a Problem of Industry*, p. 351.)

The extremely unfavourable situation in war-expanded industries such as shipbuilding, iron and steel and engineering is immediately apparent. So also is that of the textile industries, a large part of whose sales is normally made abroad; and that of dock, harbour, river, and canal service, which, though also affected to an important extent by another factor, is closely bound up with foreign trade.

Of course maladjustments of this kind tend in the long run to correct themselves. The surplus of labour in the overcrowded industries forces wages down in these as against other industries. Thus, in 1923, wage-rates in shipbuilding, engineering, coal, and cotton were substantially lower relatively to those in building, printing, and railways than they had been in 1914. Relatively low wage-rates together with high liability to unemployment tend to reduce the numbers attached to the over-crowded industries. Thus, several large industries, general engineering, electrical engineering, and marine engineering, motor vehicles, cycles and aircraft, chemicals, oil, glue, soap, etc., which, taking men and women together, increased their numbers during the war, had by 1929 got back to having less than the average percentage of unemployment.[1] But the long run is sometimes very long. The forces making for expulsion work in a very slow and hesitating manner. For this there are three principal reasons. First, as everybody knows, when only small shifts in relative numbers are needed, these can be accomplished without any adult trained person moving, simply by a change in the direction of the stream of new recruits coming into industry every year. For example, if, as appears to be the case, the average period

1 *Unemployment, a Problem of Industry*, p. 355.

of a man's industrial life is about thirty years, a contraction up to 3 per cent. per annum could, theoretically, be accomplished in a representative industry simply by no new recruits coming into it. In women's industries, where, owing to the custom of retirement on marriage, industrial life is on the average only about one-third as long, an annual contraction up to 10 per cent. could be accomplished in that way. Obviously adjustments made by the diversion of new recruits have much less friction to overcome than adjustments by the actual shifting of adult wage-earners. But the adjustments needed after the chaos of a great war are likely to be much too large for that. Great numbers of adult workers also will need to change their jobs and in many instances their homes. This they are naturally very unwilling to do; it entails a tremendous wrench. Secondly, when the demand for labour in a particular industry shrinks, there is a natural tendency to hope that the shrinkage is only temporary, and that the causes responsible for it will soon disappear. It is often easy, when one looks back afterwards, to see that this hope was false, but at the time it may be impossible to see this. Those affected prefer to face the hardship of insecure employment and low wages for what they trust is only a little while rather than uproot themselves and their families and start out on new and unknown ventures. Thirdly, and lastly, in periods when certain industries obviously need more workers—a war or a railway boom—a worker out of a job who wants to move has no difficulty in deciding where to go. But, when the only obvious thing is that his present industry needs *less* workers, such a man is in a great difficulty. In the early 1920's it was plain enough that shipbuilding and

engineering, for example, were overcrowded occupations. But what occupations were crying out for new workmen? When a few industries need to contract a great deal, even though the rest in the aggregate are prepared to expand in equal measure, since the number of new workers that any one of them is able to take on is small, the openings are not easily visible. Candidates for work may be ready to move, but have no clear guidance about where to go. The temptation to stay where they are in the vague hope that something will turn up is, therefore, very strong. The three broad influences here enumerated are bound greatly to impede and delay the appropriate contraction of industries that have been swollen up by war.

How the 'Hard Core' of Unemployment Arose

So long as heavy concentrations of unwanted workers are undispersed, heavy *aggregate* unemployment is inevitable. The period beginning with 1922 was no longer a time of slump, rather of recovery, in suchwise that, on the basis of pre-war experience, the Trade Union unemployment percentage should have been less than 4 per cent. Nevertheless, in 1923, starting at a maximum of 13·6 in January, it still stood in December at 9·3 per cent., while in 1924 its best figure (in May) was 7 per cent. and in December it was up again to 9·2 per cent. Throughout the two years the monthly percentage recorded for insured workpeople in Great Britain and Northern Ireland was only once below 10 per cent. for men (9·9 per cent. in May, 1924) and never below 9·3 per cent. for men and women together. The absolute number of persons recorded as unemployed in the

insured industries was never less than a million. There was thus a hard core of unemployment, not consisting, of course, of the same persons throughout, but of many different people, some of whom were only out of work for a short time, which amounted to something like a million persons; the famous 'intractable million'.[1] Nor, in spite of the fact that methods of recording unemployment after the war were different from what they had been, is there any good ground for thinking that the great excess prevailing in post- as against pre-war years was a mere statistical appearance. The concordance between the unemployment insurance figures and the Trade Union returns during the period when both were available is too close for that;[2] while the virtual disappearance of recorded unemployment at the present time points strongly against any such suggestion.

Prospects and Dangers after the War

It is possible that, when things have in reasonable measure settled down after the present war, our export industries will be found to have suffered a second heavy blow. But, though this is possible, it is perhaps not likely. We shall still need large imports of food and raw material; and our claims to interest by means of which these have so far been, in part, paid for, will be seriously depleted on account of sales of foreign securities made during the war. Moreover, obligations contracted in connection with the Lease-Lend Act may well call for liquidation through exports.

[1] It is of interest to note that the *extra* unemployed in 1924 as against 1911 amounted to some eight hundred thousand, while the employable population had increased by some nine hundred thousand, so that the aggregate numbers actually employed at the two dates were substantially the same.

[2] Cf. Beveridge, *Unemployment, a Problem of Industry*, p. 349

Yet again, whereas at the close of the last war policies of economic nationalism were widespread and powerful, during the present war many and potent voices have been raised, notably in the United States, in favour of arrangements designed to foster, not more restricted but, on the contrary, freer and more abundant commerce between nations. We must not forget, indeed, that statesmen in the past have frequently paid lip-service to this ideal and promptly repudiated it in action. Still it *may* happen that this time policies will march with promises. Should they do so, our export industries need not fear a second knock-down blow. Even, however, if in this respect we are better off than last time, it is against all reason to expect that, after the shattering impact of the war, the proportions of our labour wanted in various occupations will conform at all closely to the proportions in which would-be wage-earners have attached themselves to these occupations. There will be danger that men and women rendered workless in the over-staffed industries will hang on helplessly half-employed or totally unemployed; that there will thus come into being a new hard core of unemployment, men whose old skills are not wanted and who have not acquired new ones, men standing pat where they are, hoping against hope for a recovery, in engineering it may be, in shipbuilding or in textiles, that does not come; derelict workers and their families congregated together and wearing out their lives in decaying towns and depressed areas. That danger, with the experience of the last war behind us, no one can fail to foresee. The problem that will thus have to be faced—a repetition, not merely of the problem of the 1920's, but also of that which followed the great slump of 1930—is an extremely

difficult one. It is rarely possible to know for certain that depression in a particular industry or in a particular place will last long enough to warrant drastic remedies; there is a great temptation for the Government, as well as for the persons directly concerned, to wait and see. If attempts are made to introduce new industries into depressed areas, the conditions there may prove unsuitable and the attempts may fail. If, on the other hand, a policy of transferring wage-earners away from these areas is adopted, it may well happen that, while the young go, the old remain, with a life even drabber and more dull and the chances of any renewal of activity progressively weakened.

Moreover, even should these difficulties be successfully overcome and the formation of immobilized pockets of unwanted workers prevented, we shall not be entirely out of the wood. To secure that unemployment is not concentrated in depressed areas would be something. If there is to be a large number of unemployed persons it is better that they should be spread thinly over the country than concentrated in a comparatively few black spots. But obviously what is really wanted is that they shall be, not merely scattered, but absorbed into industry. This will only be possible provided that the wage-policy of Trade Unions and the monetary policy of the State are properly married together. No doubt, if monetary policy was such as to allow money income to rise freely in correspondence with rises in money wage-rates, these wage-rates could be pushed up indefinitely without direct damage to employment. But a monetary policy of this kind, besides hitting very hardly all recipients of fixed money incomes, might well lead presently to a general distrust of the currency

accompanied by violent soaring prices—that terrible 'galloping inflation,' experienced in an extreme form by Germany in the early 1920's, which threatens, not merely monetary, but also industrial, social and political chaos. With any scheme of monetary policy more restrained than this there is a limit beyond which the general average of money wage-rates cannot be pushed up except at the cost of creating unemployment. A system of Social Security, such as is contemplated in the Beveridge Report, has many great advantages. But it also threatens a risk. This is not chiefly, as is sometimes thought, that particular individuals may be tempted to prefer idleness to work when work is available, but, rather, that Trade Unions, in pressing wage demands, may not attend sufficiently to indirect reactions on the volume of unemployment, and so may bring it about that work is *not* available. Very important issues are raised here. They ought not to be burked or concealed.

Broader Prospects

So far of the transition from war to peace when the present catastrophe ends. What of our broader prospects in the days to follow? After the last war the country's economic recovery was enormously more rapid and complete than most people had thought possible. There is good evidence that in 1924 aggregate home-produced real income was not appreciably smaller than in 1913 and may well have been larger, while aggregate real income, including income from property abroad, was at the worst not much smaller than, and may have been as large as, it was in that year. No doubt, this time Great Britain has suffered, and will continue

to suffer, physical damage through air attack incomparably greater than anything experienced between 1914 and 1918. But in proportion to the total capital wealth, or even the annual productive power of the country, that damage so far, i.e. to March 1943, is very small. Apart from large-scale invasion, it is not likely at the end of the war to amount to more than a few years' work can make good. 'The possibility of a rapid repair of disasters mainly depends on whether the country has been depopulated. If its effective population have not been extirpated at the time and not starved afterwards, then, with the same skill and knowledge which they had before, with their land and its permanent improvements undestroyed, and the more durable buildings probably unimpaired, or only partially injured, they have nearly all the requisites of their former amount of production.' So a great economist wrote in the middle of the last century.[1] Another, at the end of it, following a similar line of thought, delves deeper: 'Ideas, whether those of art and science, or those embodied in practical appliances, are the most "real" of the gifts that each generation receives from its predecessors. The world's material wealth would quickly be replaced, if it were destroyed, but the ideas by which it was made were retained. If, however, the ideas were lost, but not the material wealth, then that would dwindle and the world would go back to poverty. And most of our knowledge of mere facts could quickly be recovered if it were lost, but the constructive ideas of thought remained, while, if the ideas perished, the world would enter again on the Dark Ages.'[2] In view of these considerations we need

[1] Mill, *Principles of Political Economy*, Book 1, Chapter 5, Section 7.

[2] Marshall, *Principles of Economics*, 5th edition, page 780.

not fear that, when the war is over, this country, exhausted by its efforts, must necessarily descend into poverty and squalor. There will, no doubt, as after 1918, be serious dislocation and great difficulties. But, unless we suffer invasion and defeat, the foundations of our economic strength should not be greatly impaired.

THE WORLD TO-DAY

A SERIES of short illustrated books dealing with topics which are of outstanding importance in the present world-conflict and also of permanent interest. The volumes are written by experts in an attractive style and are furnished with maps and pictures.

3*s.* 6*d.* net each

U.S.A. : An Outline of the Country, Its People, and Institutions. *By* D. W. BROGAN. 144 *pages with* 9 *pages of illustrations.*

AMERICA'S ECONOMIC STRENGTH. *By* C. J. HITCH. 116 *pages with* 8 *pages of illustrations and* 16 *diagrams.*

SOUTH AMERICA WITH MEXICO AND CENTRAL AMERICA. *By* J. B. TREND. 128 *pages with* 4 *maps and* 10 *pages of illustrations.*

CANADA. *By* B. K. SANDWELL. 128 *pages with a map and* 10 *pages of illustrations.*

AMERICA IN WORLD AFFAIRS. *By* ALLAN NEVINS. 144 *pages with* 2 *maps and* 9 *pages of illustrations.*

TURKEY. *By* BARBARA WARD. 124 *pages with* 2 *maps and* 8 *pages of illustrations.*

NORTH AFRICA. *By* ALAN H. BRODRICK. 108 *pages with* 3 *maps and* 8 *pages of illustrations.*

INDIA. *By* T. A. RAMAN. 121 *pages with a map and* 8 *pages of illustrations.*

BRITAIN AND THE BRITISH PEOPLE. *By* ERNEST BARKER. 142 *pages with* 9 *pages of illustrations.*

FRANCE. *By* PIERRE MAILLAUD. 138 *pages with* 3 *maps and* 8 *pages of illustrations.*

(*All prices are subject to alteration without notice*)

War and Peace in Malaya

By

AN INDIAN REFUGEE

KITABISTAN

ALLAHABAD

First Published May 1945

PRINTED BY J. K. SHARMA, AT THE ALLAHABAD LAW JOURNAL PRESS, ALLAHABAD AND PUBLISHED BY KITABISTAN, ALLAHABAD

WAR AND PEACE IN MALAYA

The Malay Peninsula, also known in geography as further India, begins at the Isthmus of Kra (10° North) and extends south with a general inclination towards the east. It is 750 miles long with 200 miles maximum breadth. Seventy-two per cent of it is still forest. There are countless rivers "which form the most lavish water system in the world." A range of granite mountains runs from North to South like a vertebral column dividing the Peninsula into two unequal portions. The smaller lies to the west. The latter portion has been undergoing extensive development since the Peninsula first came under British influence after 1880.

The Peninsula is bounded on the North by Siam (Thailand), on the south by the Island and Straits of Singapore, on the east by the China Sea, and on the west by the Straits of Malacca.

Tin in the form of cassiterite occurs almost all over Malaya and is found close to granite. In lime-stone it occurs in pipes and veins. The lode-mines at Sungai Lembing near Kuantan are among the world's greatest deep tin mines. The Malayan states alone produce 30% of the world's output of tin. Other minerals produced are gold, iron and galena.

The soil is fertile. In the interior brakes of bamboos are found, many of which spread for miles along the river banks. Some good hardwood timber is also available. Orchids abound. The principal fruit trees are the durian or civet fruit (the only fruit the tiger is said to eat), mangosteen, custard apple, pomegranate, rambutan, pulasan, langsat, rambai, jack-fruit, cocoanut, nut-meg, areca-nut, sugar-palm and banana. Coffee, tea, sugar-cane, rice, pepper, cloves, gambier, cotton and sago are grown with success. The principal jungle products are gutta and rubber of several varieties and many kinds of rattan. Agila-wood, the camphor tree, and ebony are found in small quantities. Rubber is the most important form of cultivation, Malaya producing 50% of the world's output.

It is now generally admitted that, though hot, the climate of Malaya compares favourably with Burma. The thermometer, even at Singapore, lying 5° north of the equator, which is the hottest part of the Peninsula, seldom rises above 93° in the shade,

while the mean for the year is below 80°. The temperature on the eastern slope is cooler, falling at night below 70°. On the hills at 3000 feet the temperature is 64° mean throughout the year and but for heavy rains compares with that of England in the autumn. Sub-tropical vegetables and flowers can be easily raised on the hills.

History and Politics

The Peninsula is divided into three sections: the Colony of the Straits Settlements, the Federated and Unfederated Malaya States. The colony of the Straits Settlements consists of the islands of Singapore and Penang, Province Wellesley, Malacca and Lebuan. The federated Malay states consist of the four sultanates of Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang. The unfederated Malay States are Johore, Kalantan, Trengganu, Kedah and Perlis.

The total population of Malaya and Singapore, including all the different races inhabiting the Peninsula, was estimated in December 1938 to amount to 5,278,866 persons. The population of Singapore was 567,000 in 1931.

Archaeological research indicates that Malaya had a long and firm connection with Hindu India. This is shown by the South Indian script of 400 A. D. which has been found in the Province of Wellesley and Kedah. Clay tablets in the Nagari script of North India of the 10th or perhaps the 7th century A. D. and a granite statue of Parvati, the consort of Shiva, and other Hindu remains have been discovered in Kedah. In Malacca, a stone Makara (or a fabulous sea-animal) of a type found in Java, may be a relic of Hindu days or a later import.

The most interesting and the oldest (14th century A. D.) Muslim relic is a stele from Trengganu, now in Raffles Museum, Singapore. It was erected by a Sri Paduka Tuan, and is in the Arabic script. It exhorts rulers, styled Mandalikas, to uphold Islam. At Pangkalan Kempas in Negri Sembilan, there are a Muslim tomb-stone of the 15th century and carved monoliths one of which is of Sumatran type, resembling the gravestone of prince Aditiawarman at Kubor Raja (A. D. 1378). There are some Muslim, Portuguese and Dutch remains in Malacca.

Ibn Khordad-Zbeh and other Arab writers of the 9th Century A. D. speak of the great Buddhist Palembang Kingdom of Sri Vijaya. They also refer to Kedah and Singapore. A stone dis-

covered in Trengganu some time ago shows that Islam reached the Peninsula in the 14th century. It destroyed the Buddhist Kingdom of Java and Sumatra.

The importance of the Malay Peninsula consisted in its situation as a convenient distributing centre for the spice trade from the Moluccas to India and Europe. As early as the 3rd Century B. C. Megasthenes mentions spices brought from "the Southern part of India" to the Ganges. So long as India held the monopoly of clove, no other foreign influence was allowed to percolate into the Peninsula. Mohammedan traders from Coromandel and Malabar, however, gradually extended their hold and ultimately broke down the Hindu monopoly in the beginning of the 16th century. These traders were also the missionaries of their religion and to them is due the conversion of the Malays to the Mohammedan creed.

The desire to obtain the monopoly of the spice trade has thus been a potent force in the fashioning of Asiatic history.

No sooner had the Portuguese found their way round the Cape of Good Hope and established themselves successfully upon the coast of East Africa, in the neighbourhood of the gulf of Aden and the Malabar coast, than Malacca, then the chief trading centre of the Malayan Archipelago, became the object of their desire. They did not take long to capture it. As their object was limited to trade, they were quite contented with the possession of the island and made no attempts to penetrate into Malaya.

In 1641 the Dutch, with the assistance of Achinese, captured Malacca from the Portuguese. They ceded it to the British in 1795. The British, however, restored it to the Dutch in 1818; but in 1824 the Dutch exchanged it for Benkulen and a few more important places in Sumatra. The British had purchased Penang from Kedah in 1786 and Singapore from Johore in 1819. The Straits Settlements—Singapore, Malacca and Penang—were ruled from India until 1867 when they were erected into a Crown Colony under the charge of the Colonial Office.

The State of Perak came under British protection in 1874 by a treaty with its Sultan. This encouraged the neighbouring States of Selangor, Negri, Sembilan and Pahang which now form the Federated Malay States to come under British protection. In 1909, Siam ceded to Britain her rights of suzerainty over the

Northern Malay States, namely Kelantan, Trengganu, Kedah and Perlis by a treaty.

The People of Malaya

The native or the indigenous element in Malaya is represented by the Malays who belong to the brown races inhabiting the islands south of Siam and Indo-China.

The Malays have had long contact both with the Indians and the Chinese for centuries. They brought to them culture and civilisation from their respective countries. India, especially, has influenced the Malay both before and after he became a Muslim. There was a Tamil quarter in old Malacca and the Baba Chinese, the descendants of the early Chinese immigrants, still have their home in the same town.

Rapid increase in the number of Chinese and Indian immigrants since the latter half of the nineteenth century led the government to adopt a pro-Malay policy. The Malays alone were regarded as the sons of the soil. All others are guests. There was also a tendency to augment the Malay proportion of the population by encouraging the Malays of Indonesia to immigrate into British Malaya. This policy was dictated by a desire to maintain a Malay race which might otherwise be submerged or overlaid by the rapidly increasing Indian and Chinese population. From 115,536 in 1901 the Indian population alone increased to 754,849 in 1937.

The Malays are generally short in stature, round-headed, with broad faces, short noses with broadish nostrils, slightly prominent jaws and cheekbones. The eyes are often oblique with epicentric fold. They belong to the Southern Mongoloid group and resemble the Japanese in some respects. The Japanese invaders took advantage of this likeness so that it proved an important factor in the Malayan campaign.

Most Malays are Sunni Mohammedans of the school of Shafi. Their conversion took place between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries A. D.

In disposition the Malays are courteous and self-respecting. They are, however, indolent, pleasure-loving, improvident, fond of bright clothing, of comfort and ease. They dislike toil exceedingly, and frequently refuse to work for a wage, particularly where strenuous manual labour is called for, though in sore need of cash. Their sexual morality is rather unconventional. While prostitution

is not common, they take full advantage of polygamy sanctioned by their religion. By nature free, they cannot bear any sort of restraint although they are marvellously loyal to their raja or chief. They are prone to run amuck when driven to desperation. Losing all self-control, a Malay may kill all he may meet until he himself is slain. During the Japanese occupation of Malaya there have been instances of Malays running amuck on seeing their womenfolk being raped by Japanese soldiers, thus inviting horrible reprisals and wholesale burning of their villages.

Malaya under Britain

The Straits Settlements, Singapore, Penang, Malacca and Labuan formed a British Colony together with their dependencies. As such, they were an integral part of the King's dominions. All persons born in them had the status of British subjects. The four Federated Malay States had a single Federal Council and four state councils and were administered by British officials on behalf of their Sultans under the general authority of the Governor of the Straits Settlements, who was ex-officio High Commissioner for the Malay States. Devolution of powers to the State units of the federation, rather than a rigid control of a centralised bureaucracy, was the trend of the modern policy. The five unfederated Malay States were autonomous in their domestic affairs. There was, however, a British Advisor attached to each State. He gave advice on all matters except Malay customs and religion.

The rapid opening up of the country and the remarkable development of its natural resources was due to foreign investments which flowed in by reason of the security that an efficient administration provided. The main targets were tin and rubber, and practically every nation shared in the industries related to their growth and development.

The racial composition of Malaya bears a cosmopolitan texture. Indians and Chinese, who together far exceed the total Malay population of the Archipelago, have already been mentioned. There were, besides, Europeans of all the nationalities, Americans and Australians and people of almost every Asiatic race.

The population of Japanese nationals was estimated at 7,951 in December, 1938. They could own land, plant and mine. In 1932, there were 2,301 estates in Malaya of 100 acres and over. Of the total, Indians, with a population of over a three-quarter million,

owned exactly the same area as the rather less than eight thousand Japanese, that is, three per cent each. The Japanese were still more fortunate in the matter of mining. They acquired mining rights in the various states in Malaya but no Indian had a similar concession. In the case of public limited liability companies covering 43 per cent of the total area planted with rubber in Malaya, of estates of 1000 acres and over the Japanese possessed 7 as against 3 owned by Chinese and none by an Indian or a Malay. All this was despite the fact that no foreigner is allowed to own land in Japan or the Japanese Empire. It may be of interest to note that the Japanese were the last in the field in the exploitation of Malaya. They should also be the last to complain of "economic strangulation" as a motive for their wanton war of conquest.

The Government had before the war been taking many steps to raise the status of the Malay and to protect him, so to say, from himself. Huge areas of land in the Federated Malay States were declared to be Malay Reservations. The land in these reservations could only be alienated to the Malays and must thereafter remain in Malay hands. Even in execution of a decree against the owner, special permission had to be obtained for selling such land. At the sale, no one except a Malay had the right to bid. Laws against usury were enacted to protect the Malay from money-lenders. Special educational facilities were provided for enlightenment and the Civil Service of the Federated Malay States was open to them only. The Malay State Guides, as the Indian contingent which until shortly before the war was used to garrison the F. M. S. was known, was replaced by a Malay Contingent which was recruited purely from amongst the Malays and mainly officered by men of their own race. They were also given preference in every Department of the federal service.

There was no political and social strife in the country. The people of all races inhabiting the Peninsula freely mixed with one another. There was no income-tax in Malaya, and Singapore was a Free Port.

The Japanese Infiltration

The first Japanese immigrants into Malaya were young women who soon practically monopolised the oldest profession. In their wake came Japanese photographers, barbers, dentists, masseurs,

small shop-keepers and, last but not least, fishermen. Capital then began to flow and soon acquired large planting and mining interests. The iron mines in Johore and Trengganu were exclusively owned and worked by the Japanese.

All Japanese concerns employed Japanese staff except where the employment of Chinese or Indians became absolutely necessary. The Japanese did not perform manual labour. Within a few years after the first world war, there was hardly a town or village of any consequence where there was not a Japanese shop, a barber or a prostitute.

It is known that the sprinkling of Japanese nationals all over Malaya was not a matter of chance. It was deliberately designed by the Japanese Home Government to create an effective fifth column in the country. As was discovered during the course of the Malayan campaign most of the residents were agents of the Foreign Office, which paid them for espionage and information. Most of them lived respectably with family and two assistants. They could not afford all this on a total turnover of less than $ 100 per mensem (Rupees one hundred and fifty) which was what they could earn at the most. But no one bothered about how they managed to maintain their standard, because no one ever feared that the security of the country was in danger.

The Fortress of Malaya

This complacency had some excuse in the background. Malaya was defended by the great naval base of Singapore which had cost between 50 and 60 million sterling and taken 20 years to build. It had 20 sq. miles of deep sea anchorage, which could easily accommodate the combined British and American fleets. It had a floating dock large enough for a 45-thousand-ton battleship, a smaller floating dock for the repair of destroyers and submarines, a graving dock which could accommodate a leviathan like the *Queen Mary*. Singapore Naval base had bigger and better guns than those of Gibraltar. It was an impregnable fortress from the sea, because guns commanded all approaches. They were, however, housed in concrete and could not be moved or manoeuvred for action in a contrary direction.

The establishment of this base had provoked loud protestations from Tokyo. Such a precaution, it said, was unnecessary

view of the friendly relations that existed between Japan and Great Britain.

The Peninsula, besides, was bounded on the north by Siam, a friendly power for which Britain had done so much. It was protected in the east by the naval base of Hong Kong; it was guarded in the west by the naval units housed in Indian ports and the naval station of Trincomalee. The marshy jungles of the Peninsula provided an effective natural defence against any modern army which must inevitably be equipped with heavy guns, tanks, and armoured cars. And the only potential enemy, Japan, had her hands full in China.

Such considerations fostered a tendency in the minds of both the people and the administration, to ignore any possibility of danger. So much so that the Japanese-controlled newspaper the *Singapore Herald*, was allowed to operate right up to December 8, when Singapore experienced the first bombing from Japanese planes. The ignorant and the unimaginative listener to Japanese propaganda may be excused if he was taken in by the lame apologia that Japan was forced into war by the A. B. C. D. powers freezing her credits and other such nonsense.

Japan Prepares to Invade

It can now be asserted without fear of contradiction that Japan had been preparing for the Malayan campaign for years. She had been secretly training a huge army for jungle warfare in Hainan where conditions are similar to those prevailing in Malaya. She had provided Malay inhabitants of villages, situated on the route their army eventually took, with bicycles which the Japanese army used in its advance. The Japanese army brought with it spurious notes resembling in colour and design the genuine currency of the country which must have been printed long before the invasion.

The almost open activities of the Japanese agents and spies went unpunished, and the fifth-column which the Japanese had established in Malaya had an easy task. Even after it was proved in a court of law that the Japanese Consulate in Singapore was being used for fifth-columnist activities in a trial in which a member of the British forces was convicted of selling information to the Japanese, no action was taken against the Consulate or the Japanese. It was known that the relations of the wife of Wang Ching Wei, the Japanese puppet, who hailed from Penang were Japanese agents.

Yet no action was taken against them, because there was no proof which could stand muster in a court of law. No martial law was declared until more than half of Malaya was in enemy hands.

Britain had never contemplated that Siam would stab her in the back. Speaking on August 19 at Kuala Lampur, Sir Shenton Thomas, the Governor of Singapore, referring to the arrival of the largest single convoy of Australian troops, said:

> "We are happy to have on our northern border the friendly territory of Thailand (Siam) to whom we are linked with bonds of mutual regard and to whose peace-loving people we wish well."

The Siamese Military Mission to Malaya had already been shown the country's defences.

In pursuance of the "open door" policy to give all nations free access to colonial resources, Japan was allowed to own most of the iron-ore mines in Malaya, and the exports of ore to Japan in 1939 from this source had jumped to 2 million tons from 1.1/2 million tons in the previous year. The Malayan authorities never imagined that this very iron was being used by Japan to forge weapons against the British.

It will be recalled that Japan had landed troops and aircraft in Siam and had secured the use of Siamese airbases with the right to construct new ones. They had done the same thing in Indo-China. Japanese public men, however, raised their hands in virtuous indignation at the strengthening of the defences of Singapore and the Dutch East Indies, and treated such measure as evidence of a policy of "encirclement" directed against an innocent Japan. A direct charge by President Roosevelt that Japanese actions were in the nature of aggression against the Allies was answered by Tojo who stated that they were precautionary measures against a possible attack from China. But Allied suspicions had been roused. Japan hurriedly sent a special envoy of peace to Washington in the person of Kurusu. The world knows today that at the same moment that Kurusu was leaving Tokyo, Japan was feverishly completing elaborate preparations for aggression against America and Britain, and giving finishing touches to the blow which was to be struck at Pearl Harbour and in Malaya.

British air reconnaissance of December 6 and 7, 1941, had established that numerous Japanese transports escorted by warships

were proceeding down the coast of Southern Thailand apparently preparing to land in Singora and Patami, which lie on the north-east boundary of Malaya. H. M. S. *Prince of Wales* and *Repulse* were in Singapore waters, but no action was taken against the Japanese fleet as no war had been declared.

Japan Strikes

In the early hours of the morning of Monday, December 8, before the people of Malaya had heard of Japan's declaration of war, Japanese planes flew over Penang and Singapore and dropped a few bombs. It is noteworthy that Singapore was fully illuminated during the Japanese air-raid. In both of these raids bombs were dropped on purely non-military objectives and in quarters exclusively used by Asiatics. In Singapore the objective was Chulia Shiet, an exclusively Asiatic quarter inhabited mostly by Indian Mohammedans. It was they who suffered 75 per cent of deaths through this raid, the rest being Chinese.

In leaflets dropped by their planes, the Japanese informed the Malayan public that the war was carried on solely against the Europeans. There is, however, ample evidence to show that they made deliberate and sustained attacks on the Asiatic civilian population.

The first major attack on Penang was made on the morning of December 11, with 27 Japanese bombers flying in a perfect 'V' formation. These bombers divebombed the town in groups of three.

According to an eye-witness, they came in wave after wave, dropped their bombs, pulled up, circled round and then came back again. The bombs dropped were heavy demolition bombs, anti-personnel bombs, and incendiary bombs of the type that scatter hundreds of pieces of a red substance like sealing-wax, the smallest piece of which starts a fire on coming in contact with some inflammable material. They were dropped on the densely crowded Asiatic quarters, killing thousands of people. After unloading their bombs the planes came back and machine-gunned the people in the streets, and it continued for nearly two hours. Exactly the same thing happened during the next two days. Fires raged for days and could not be controlled, because the first Japanese target had been the fire-station.

What happened in Penang made even those Asiatics who had secretly cherished a faith in the Japanese slogan of Asia for the

Asiatics, weep tears of rage, anguish, and helplessness at the sight of their burning houses, corpses of their kith and kin torn limb from limb with pariah dogs sniffing at their remains. The streets were littered with bodies and one could hardly walk on the side-walks without stepping on a human limb or maybe on a human brain. The stench of thousands of decomposing bodies pervaded the town.

Penang was evacuated on December 16 and the Japanese occupied it the next day. Their first act was to broadcast to Singapore in English beginning with "Hello, Singapore this is Penang calling, how do you like our bombing." Their second act was to execute the Chief of the United China Relief Fund (to help the Chinese war effort) in front of his house, in full view of his wives, children and relatives. While this tragedy was being enacted in Penang other serious things were happening on the sea and land.

Simultaneously with the air attacks on Malaya, the Japanese had started landing troops on the South Coast of Siam along the border of Malaya. On the 8th H. M. S. *Prince of Wales* and *Repulse* which had arrived in Singapore a few days before, proceeded north and were destroyed by the enemy air force on December 10.

The Gallantry of the Defenders

The first landings were made on the coastal area of Kelantan and Kedah. Enemy troops were armed with tommy-guns and used armoured vehicles and tanks which the defenders were not expecting. Thailand (Siam) had surrendered after a token resistance and Thai soldiers crossed the border into Burma with the Japanese invaders. The Japanese took full advantage of their resemblance to the local inhabitants, and dressed up as Malays they penetrated the defence line and surrounded the outposts in the jungle and shot them up from all sides.

Fifth-columnists, who as peaceful traders used to sell the defence-troops eggs, cigarettes, fruits, etc. and were free to move in their lines, suddenly appeared with tommy-guns and attacked the troops who had only rifles as their weapons of offence and defence. With no air support and no tanks, out-numbered, outarmed and last but not least hamstrung through the treachery of the Japs, the Thais and the fifth columnists, the only thing left to the defence was to make the Japanese advance as costly to them as possible. The whole story of the Malayan campaign, therefore, is one of

fighting withdrawals from Kedah to Johore Bharu until the final tragedy of the surrender of Singapore on February 15, 1942. It was, however, a magnificent withdrawal and the stories of heroism of the retreating troops are legion. In their retreat they fought every inch of the way; every river-crossing, every village, and every defile was bitterly contested. Indian troops who formed the majority of the garrison of Malaya, together with their British and Australian comrades, did their very best to bar the way on every possible invasion route and took a very heavy toll of the advancing enemy. Their morale was always of the highest. In his new year broadcast on Jan. 1, 1942 General Sir Archibald Wavell said "Never has the reputation of Indian troops stood higher or their exploits been more admired."

Typical is the tale of three Indians who were cut off from their units and captured by the Japanese. They were offered generous rewards if they led Japanese troops behind a certain British position. The Indians pretended to agree. They were marched in front of a Japanese column with tommy-guns pressed into their backs. But instead of leading them (the Japanese) behind the British lines, they dauntlessly led them straight into the line of British cross-fire. The Indians miraculously escaped being killed.

An Indian Infantry Brigade consisting of Dogras which had been fighting for a fortnight was attacked on the beaches. Concentrated in five posts it fought on till the ammunition was exhausted. After this the Dogras went for the invaders with their hatchets, and one man is believed to have killed seven of the enemy.

A Jamadar from Kangra rallied his troops on Badong beach and attacked and counter-attacked from the early hours till nightfall, assisted by a Havildar, also from Kangra. When ordered to withdraw, several of the posts refused to do so until their 2nd in command and the above-mentioned Jamadar had themselves identified and rectified the order.

Hundreds of such acts were witnessed but thousands went unnoticed. From the accumulated evidence of those who saw the Indians in action in the various theatres of the Malayan campaign, it is abundantly clear, however, that hillmen and plainsmen, frontiersmen and men from the ricefields of South India—Hindus, Moslems, Sikhs and Gurkhas—all showed equal skill, gallantry and

devotion to duty in the novel and intricate jungle-warfare of Malaya.

The Japanese Barbarity

As they advanced into Malaya the Japanese conveniently forgot their promised rôle of 'liberators' and 'brother Asiatics.' They began to indulge in their national pastimes of plunder, murder and rape. First would come to a village or a town some officers armed to the teeth, riding on motor-bicycles with printed notices in Malaya and Chinese announcing that concealment of food, money and women would be punished with death. They would be soon followed by the main body which would commandeer the food, round up the women, and exchange the money with Japanese military notes which resembled in colour and design the genuine currency. They merely stated "the Japan Government" promises to pay the bearer on demand the sum of "Dollars." The notes were not signed by any authority nor was the place of payment stated.

The Japanese did not respect the religious institutions either. Despite radio assurances to the effect that due respect would be shown to places and objects of worship, mosques were bombed on Fridays in particular, killing civilian worshippers; religious schools were sacked and the Holy Qoran desecrated.

The Japanese did not always get away with it. The story of how some retiring Gurkhas, who had by now become familiar with the Japanese technique, turned the tables on them in Kedah is very interesting indeed. They were ordered to withdraw from a village, but conscious of their likeness to the Malays, decided to give the advancing Japanese troops a little bit of their own medicine. They dressed themselves in Malay clothes and hiding their Kukris underneath the flowing and loose Malay Bajus (resembling night-shirts) lay in wait for the coming enemy troops. The Japanese adopted the usual procedure. First came in a couple of officers on motor-bicycles and stuck up the usual notices. Then followed a company of soldiers demanding money and women. Out came the Gurkhas' deadly Kukris and not one of the Japanese escaped. The Gurkhas then retired to new positions.

High Morale of the Australians

The Australian troops in Malaya were all volunteers and many of them had left homes and good positions to do their bit for Malaya.

They were in first-class condition; their morale was high and they were itching for action. In his opening engagement Major-General Cordon Bennet, Officer Commanding the A. I. F., resolved to lead the enemy into a trap. Choosing a bridge on the main road near Gemas, he prepared for its demolition, and a small number of men upon whom would devolve the task of blowing it up concealed themselves in the jungle nearby. Other troops took up positions in the jungle on each side of the bridge. On January 15 the Japanese came and marched over the bridge blissfully unaware of what was in store for them. Several companies were allowed to cross the bridge when the officer-in-charge of the demolition released the fuse. The bridge and the Japanese still on it were blown to bits. The explosion was the signal for the Australians to fall upon the enemy. Nearly all the Japanese who had crossed the bridge estimated at 1,000, were killed. This engagement cost the Australians only 100 men in killed and wounded. The job done they fell back south of Segamut.

Between Segamut and Yong Peng the Australians, now joined by remnants of the 45th Indian Brigade, fought many battles attacking, counter-attacking, constructing tank-traps, digging trenches, felling trees and doing all that was humanly possible to delay the enemy. On the 21st their way was blocked by a bridge that was in the hands of the Japanese who were firing machine-guns from behind sand-bags. There was no other way of retreat. Ambulances with the worst cases of wounded and dying drove up to the bridge. Permission was asked of the Japanese to let them through. But the Japanese refused unless the entire force surrendered unconditionally. This the force would not do, even though it was in an utterly hopeless situation. It had been fighting without a break for six days, was beleagured by a numerically superior enemy assisted by snipers concealed in the trees, was open to fire from all sides, and had been without food or clothes for days. It was a question of honour. The ambulances came back. Eventually 650 men out of an estimated total of 1600 strong succeeded in rejoining the main body.

Only a few Japanese prisoners were taken because the defending soldiers were on the retreat almost all the time. The few who were taken were well treated and sent to India. Some of them were caught in the Batu Pahat area in Johore where they had landed dressed as Chinese.

The Siege of Singapore

The siege of Singapore began on January 31. On the same day General Percival issued an Order of the Day in which he stated:

> "Our task is to hold this fortress until help comes, as assuredly it will come; this we are determined to do."

In besieged Singapore there was no shortage of food. There was meat, rice and flour to spare. The shortage of fresh vegetables and fruit was made up by large stocks of tinned fruits and vegetables. Milk was plentiful and so was liquor. The only thing Singapore wanted was aircraft and reinforcements. On February 5 there was an Order of the Day by General Wavell which said:

> "Our part is to gain time for great reinforcements which we and our American Allies are sending to the Eastern theatre. We are in a similar position to the original British expeditionary force which stopped the Germans and saved Europe in the first battle of Ypres. We must be worthy successors to them and save Asia by fighting these Japanese. We have now reached an area where we cannot be constantly outflanked and where the enemy cannot exploit superior mobility. We must yield no strip of ground without fighting hard, and must leave nothing behind undestroyed that would be of the least service to the enemy....I look to you all to fight this battle without further thought of retreat, and to make the defence of Singapore as memorable and successful an exploit as the defence of Tobruk which British, Australian and Indian troops held so long and so gallantly."

One of the worst weapons the besieged had to fight was Japanese propaganda which sent ridiculously false stories on the ether designed to shatter public morale. One such story was that the U. S. was negotiating a separate peace with Japan. While there was some respite from air bombing there was none from this propaganda-firing, which went on incessantly.

The Governor had said: "Singapore must not, shall not fall." The hope was built on the promised reinforcements.

The Japanese artillery fire steadily increased in volume as the days passed. They had evidently been bringing more and more guns of all calibres into action to add to the daily bombings and machine-gunning from the air.

The Japanese landings on Singapore started in the morning of February. They slipped across in boats under cover of darkness. Machine-gunners on the fore-shore did their best to stop them. But they went on despite heavy losses. They had also, in the meantime, repaired the causeway with the help of pontoon bridges. The landing troops, therefore, were fully supported by tanks. When dawn broke some thousands of Japanese shock troops had secured a firm foothold on the island. The promised reinforcement had not arrived.

All counter-attacks failed against numbers, against tanks, superior arms and against air attacks. The British, the Australians and the Indian troops, the British Chinese and Indian volunteers fought on incessantly and bravely in what they knew now was a hopeless situation. On February 11, Yamashita, the Japanese Commander, demanded the surrender of the garrison. The paper which was dropped by a plane promised full consideration "from the standpoint of Bushido." This was ignored and the forces fought doggedly on. By the 14th, the enemy had gained control of the two reservoirs in the centre of the island. The naval base was occupied. The defenders were pounded incessantly by dive-bombers and artillery. They had been fighting for nearly a week with hardly any rest. The promised reinforcements had still not come. Capitulation was inevitable. Yet the garrison decided to wait for another 24 hours. Finally on Sunday, February 15, Singapore surrendered to the enemy, trusting in Japanese Bushido that Yamashita had promised.

Plunder, Loot and Massacre

After the occupation of Singapore the Japanese, according to an announcement by Tokyo radio, immediately set about clearing up "seditious elements" in the city. The British forces were interned in the barracks at Changi in the extreme east of the island and British civilians were rounded up and confined to the Sea-view Hotel area. The city was then given up to the Japanese soldiers for looting and rapine, which lasted for a week. Every Chinese male was ordered out of doors in wide open places for examination by Japanese military. Most of these unfortunate people had to wait in sun and rain without food or drink for three days during which about 50 thousand of them, suspected of having borne arms or of belonging to the communist party, were shot, beheaded, drowned or im-

prisoned. Those in the black lists of the Japanese were similarly treated. A whole regiment of Indians was treated to Japanese bayonet practice after their hands were tied behind them. Only one escaped by feigning death to tell the tale. Many Japanese military officers drove round the town followed by lorries to collect human flesh for the army. On the first day they collected six hundred young girls from respectable Chinese houses at the point of the revolver. Many a thousand others must have been raped during this week of terror.

After the first week of the occupation the so-called normal conditions, in Japanese parlance, were said to have been established. All motor-cars, motor-bicycles, radio-sets by whomsoever owned and all Khaki cloth in the city shops were confiscated by the army.

Ceiling prices for all goods still remaining after the loot in the city shops were fixed by the Japanese military command. Some Chinese and Indian shopkeepers arrested for charging a cent or two over and above the scheduled price were tied hand and foot to stakes driven in to the ground in public open places for three days without food or drink. On the fourth day their heads were chopped off. A few Indian employees of the Singapore Municipality charged with concealing khaki cloth met a similar fate.

An order was issued by the military authorities requiring every owner of a bicycle to register the same on payment of a fee. Before the order was properly announced some Chinese while riding on their bicycles in the town were arrested by Japanese military police and lodged in a cell. Next morning they were all shot. On protest being lodged with the chief military authority, a typical Japanese reply was received. "Execution without trial," it said, "is regretted but not much harm is done. There are so many Chinese traitors the less to conspire against Japan."

Singapore, the "city of the lion," was the ancient Sanskrit name given to it by its Hindu founder. The Japanese did not like it and changed it to "Shonan." They also erected a Shinto Shrine where the Hindus, Muslims, Buddhists and people belonging to other faiths in Malaya have to worship the Japanese Emperor.

News is Banned

The end of the first week of the Japanese occupation found Malaya a sealed book. No adverse comment or criticism was

allowed to go outside. A vague picture of the conditions prevailing in that hapless land may, however, be drawn from the radiocasts which have off and on been unwittingly frank and communicative.

An outline of the general policy can be had from the statement of Col. Watanabe, vice-chief of the Singapore government. "Exaggerated mercy towards the population," he said to a press conference soon after the occupation, "must be rigorously suppressed." It seems that this policy was pursued by the Japanese military administration in the same spirit in which it was intended by Watanabe. Otherwise it is difficult to understand why Tojo should have swerved to a policy of placating the subject people just about one year after their subjection. The explanation must be sought in the bitterness, silent or vocal, that a high-handed policy must have aroused. It is true that the mounting strength of the Allied counter-offensive was partly responsible for this change in the councils of the Japanese political high command; but that alone could not have brought about the big change if the people were co-operating the way the Japanese wished.

However that may be, the world was given to understand that the Japanese were going to give independence to Malaya. Its quality was left to the listeners to judge. In the meantime, the government at the spot went on doing what it liked. For example, on August 20, 1943 it signed a treaty with Siam, thereby transferring to her sovereignty four Malayan States and two Shan States. The Malays were told to view the step in the broad aspect of collective security. A Japanese commentator announced:

> "The step should bring home to the rather mediaeval Malay mind the need for sacrifice of parochial affiliations based on religion and culture, in order to foster the more important, all-embracing loyalty to the sphere of Pan-Asianism."

The day the treaty was signed, the Siamese Assembly passed a bill rescinding the Muslim marriage laws.

The first beginning towards independence was made by the appointment of an advisory council. Half of its members were to be Japanese; the other half were to be selected by the military administration from amongst those who had an "unswerving faith in the ideals for which Japan is fighting." The Sultans of the states who had hitherto enjoyed some sort of autonomy were

placed in a subordinate position to the Japanese governors of their states. Whereas under the British, the Sultan was assisted by an adviser, under the Japanese the Sultan himself served the Japanese governor in the capacity of an adviser. The greatest anomaly lay in the fact that even after the promise of independence had been made, the offices of the military administration and the post of governors of the various provinces were filled by Japanese who, it was said, were "managing all affairs with promptitude," and therefore "all aspects of the administration have assumed a deeper Japanese colouring."

Having granted "a share in administration"—the Japanese felt perfectly justified in compelling the inhabitants to join the Defence Corps formed to "assist the Army." But the movement failed. This forced them to set up a new Propaganda Council in Singapore of some 46 members, with a clear majority of the Japanese. Its chief task is firstly to do liaison between the Japanese Military and the civilians, and secondly to operate as a recruiting body for labour services. Chinese shop assistants and office clerks, reduced to poverty and unemployment by the invaders, were enrolled in the Chinese Labour Service Corps, while the Sultans (whom the Japanese now call merely 'chiefs') were called at several conferences to mobilise the Muslim youth for labour work.

Economically Col. Watanabe described the "main object" of the administration to be, "to obtain control of all raw materials to be utilised for the conduct of war." So it sent "as much bauxite, palm oil and rubber back to Japan as she asked for" despite the shortage of shipping. This policy of unremitting plunder naturally found the country prostrate and the people on the verge of starvation.

In September 1943, a Japanese news agency issued a long article on Malayan economic conditions, which gives a graphic account of the life the people lead and the economic policy the Japanese pursue. The article eulogises the up-hill fight of the Japanese to solve the grave economic problems. The first achievement mentioned by the article is the Japanese drive to combat inflation. Now inflation in Malaya is clearly a Japanese creation, and it has developed for two main reasons: first, because the Japanese army made payments for loot in forged currency notes, printed innumerably by the Japanese machines without any real financial backing. The *Nippon Hyoron* vindicates the statement

in an article in its December issue of 1942. According to it "the economic warfare of the southern Regions began first with currency. In Malaya, the Philippines, the East Indies and Burma, wherever our military forces advanced, the military notes went with them. Fortunately this form of economic warfare achieved splendid results. The denomination of these notes was the same as that hitherto used in local currency—the circulation went smoothly.... Afterwards in Malaya, however, investigations revealed that owing to the Second Great War the actual amount of strait dollars in circulation has expanded to three times the pre-war amount." Secondly, inflation had developed because the Malayans had nothing to spend this money on. Japan has been unable to keep Malaya supplied with the necessities of life, not even with food and clothing, and it has not been possible to import anything because of the shortage of shipping.

The Japanese resorted to a vigorous savings drive in order to check inflation. The military administration did not even spare children and forced them "to put their money in Japanese banks." According to the *Nippon Hyoron* these banks had come fast in the wake of the Japanese army. In its December, 1942 issue it wrote:

> "The first monetary measure in Malaya was the opening of our banks. The Yokohama Specie Bank and the Bank of Taiwan advanced almost in line with our troops. The smoke of the battle had hardly cleared away before they (bankers) began their activities, opening up branches or establishing agencies."

This obviously contradictory policy of encouraging inflation on the one hand and trying to check it on the other has led to the complete disorganisation of the local currency.

Early in January 1944 the Japanese Military Administration proclaimed that it had three main objectives in mind: (1) development of resources for defence (2) security of peace and order, and (3) economic self-sufficiency. The need for economic self-sufficiency apparently arose from lack of imports which usually supplied Malaya's needs. Cloth was made from the fibre of Kapok and banana-stems, castor plant and pine-apple leaves. Leather for the use of civilians was made from wood-shavings, and bags from latex and coir. That the food situation too had greatly deteriorated is shown by a Japanese news agency message of July, 1943: "Bread

and other foods," it said, "can in future be made from a flour-like substance obtained from the residue left after oil is extracted from palm nuts."

Lately, even right to export and import the articles of the occupied countries (Malaya included) such as palm-oil, lumber, rope, lead, zinc, caustic soda, automobiles, vegetables, fruits, raw fish, eggs, rubber goods, stationery, toilet articles, furniture, iron ore, scrap iron, tin, bauxite, manganese, latex, salts, rice and sugar, has been taken over by the Japanese Military Administration. This measure has stopped all private enterprises, and thus left the people completely to the mercy of the authorities. They have no other means of earning their livelihood except by joining the labour squads.